FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 018

26 January 1983

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Kvitsinskiy Arrives in Geneva, Makes Statement AA 1
Soviet MBFR Delegation Arrives in Vienna 25 Jan AA 1
Bogachev Views U.S. Stance at Geneva Talks AA 1
Novikov Criticizes U.S. Response to Pact Proposals AA 2
Kulikov Interviewed on Disarmament Talks [ADN] AA 3
Western Opposition to U.S. Disarmament Stance Noted AA 4
[Zhukov in PRAVDA]
NOVOYE VREMYA Urges Serious Approach to Pact Offer AA 5
Petrov in Interview Discusses SALT Issues AA 5
[Bratislava PRAVDA 22 Jan]
Pact Proposals 'Realistic' Approach to Security AA 9
[Petrov in PRAVDA 24 Jan]
NATO, Pact Stances on European Security Contrasted AA 12
[Kuznetsov in PRAVDA 19 Jan]
Western Opposition to Nuclear Armaments Noted AA 15
[Ponomarev]
UK Journal Welcomes Soviet Arms Proposals AA 16
PRAVDA Criticizes FRG Paper's Arms 'Insinuations' AA 17
[26 Jan]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 1
PRAVDA Views Week's International Events CC 3
[Zhukov, 23 Jan]
East-West Views on Arms Limitation Talks [Zhukov] CC 7
Western Propaganda on Pipeline Workers Refuted CC 8
[PRAVDA]
MOSCOW NEWS Analyzes Energy Use, OPEC Problems CC 9
Mutually Beneficial Economic Cooperation Urged CC 10
[MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN Jan]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Soviet Reaction to State of the Union Address A 1
Moscow Report A 1
TASS Comment [Pakhomov] A 1
PRAVDA Evaluates Reagan's First 2 Years in Office A 3
[Vishnevskiy, 22 Jan]
Soviet Scholar Examines Reagan Economic Program A 6
[Skorov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Jan]

U.S. Opposition to 'Reaganomics' Noted A 6
Opinion Poll Cited on Reagan Popularity Rating A 7
State Department Spokesman's Remarks Criticized A 8
[Olin]
Sorokin Article Examines U.S. Foreign Policy A 9
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jan]
'Peace Supporters' Demonstrate in California A 14
IZVESTIYA Reports Plight of U.S. Vietnam Veterans A 15
[Palladin]

CHINA

Zorin Discusses U.S.-PRC Trade 'Disagreement' B 1
Death Sentence on Mao's Widow Commuted B 1

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Seeks Better Relations With Neighbors D 1

EASTERN EUROPE

USSR-Polish Economic Cooperation Talks End F 1
[Warsaw]
Polish Deputy Premier Comments [PAP] F 1
Polish-Soviet Industrial Symposium Begins F 2
[Warsaw]
Hungarian-Soviet Trade Protocol for 1983 Signed [MTI] F 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Paper Features Section on USSR-FRG Economic Ties G 1
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 16 Jan]
FRG Groups Oppose U.S. Missile Deployment Plans G 2
Nine New French Strategic Missiles Installed [AFP] G 2
Zagladin in France for PCF Symposium on Marx G 2
Meets With PCF's Gremetz G 2
International Symposium Opens G 3
[PRAVDA 21 Jan]
Gromyko, Italian Envoy Discuss Soviet Proposals G 3
Dutch 'Blackout' on Soviet Spy Incident Discussed G 3
[Brussels LE SOIR 22-23 Jan]
Bombs Sent to London Aeroflot, Intourist Offices G 4
[London PRESS ASSOCIATION 25 Jan]
Soviet Ecumenical Delegation in UK, Ireland G 4
Council of Ministers Cables Irish Prime Minister G 5
Soviet Proposal on Cyprus 'Timely,' 'Practical' G 5
[Aleksin]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S. Policy on Lebanon, Troop Withdrawal Viewed [Kuvaldin] H 1
U.S. Arms Sales to Israel Risk Mideast Security [Timoshkin] H 1
Moscow Examines Israeli 'Threat' to Syria [Lapin] H 2
Further Comment [Krichevskiy] H 3
Moscow Previews Mubarak Visit to United States H 3
Radio Comments on Visit [Timoshkin] H 4
'Arafat Interview With Lebanese Weekly Cited H 4
New PLO Representative in Moscow Appointed [INA] H 5
Israeli Defense Minister's Visit to Zaire Viewed [Fesunenko] H 5
Soviet Delegation Begins Visit to PDRY [cross-reference] H 6

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Events '22 Years Later' Parallel Cuban Crisis [Glebov] K 1
U.S. Support for Salvadoran Junta Condemned K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Fedorchuk Attends Internal Affairs Conference R 1
Moscow Gorkom Debates Tasks, Shortcomings R 1
Message From Andropov R 2
Aliyev Addresses Communications Ministers R 2
Azerbaijan's Bagirov Receives Order of Lenin R 2
Tajik SSR Adopts Republic's Socialist Pledges R 3
Rashidov Attends Uzbek Party Aktiv Meeting R 3
RSFSR Minister Outlines Plans To Improve Services R 4
Kapitonov Activities in Belorussia Reported [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 15 Jan] R 5
Achievements, Failings of Literary Press Assessed [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 5 Jan] R 6

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Pipeline Construction, Specifications Reported S 1
Refrigeration Units S 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Discipline, Incentives in Armed Forces Viewed [Mikora in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jan] V 1
Gen Tolubko Stresses Role of Officer's Example [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jan] V 5
DOSAAF Official on Defense Work Month, Tasks [Mosyaykin] V 8

KVITSINSKIY ARRIVES IN GENEVA, MAKES STATEMENT

LD251414 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Geneva January 25 TASS -- The Soviet delegation to the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe has arrived in Geneva today. Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, head of the delegation, made the following statement for the press upon arrival in Geneva's Cointrin Airport:

"The Soviet delegation has arrived in Geneva to continue the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe.

"This problem is becoming increasingly urgent and acute. Guiding itself by the desire to facilitate and expedite its solution, the Soviet Union has put forward far-reaching, honest and constructive proposals, stated in the report of Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on December 21, 1982. The Soviet position makes it possible to reach agreement. This possibility is quite realistic. The world at large knows about it.

"The talks will show whether it is realised. The time is drawing nearer for making a choice between an agreement on joint steps to lower the level of nuclear confrontation or another round of the arms race. The Soviet Union has offered its choice. It stands for a fair agreement on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. It does not need military superiority but will not allow superiority over itself. If the other side has the desire to reach agreement, it should be demonstrated in practice now."

SOVIET MBFR DELEGATION ARRIVES IN VIENNA 25 JAN

LD251420 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Vienna January 25 TASS -- A Soviet delegation has arrived here today to take part in the 29th round of talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe that is opening on January 27. The Soviet delegation at the talks is headed by Ambassador Valerian Mikhaylov.

BOGACHEV VIEWS U.S. STANCE AT GENEVA TALKS

LD251722 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 25 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Paul Nitze, the head of the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe, is taking along to Geneva the old U.S. proposals, calling for the complete dismantling of all Soviet medium-range missiles on the entire Soviet territory while all the existing NATO nuclear armaments in Europe should be preserved completely intact.

They say that this offer, put forward by the United States, came to be known as "zero option" primarily because, according to Washington plans, it is called upon to reduce to naught any chance of reaching progress in curbing the nuclear arms race and ensuring the deployment of new American missiles on the continent.

Before leaving Washington, Nitze unambiguously stated that the American side had no intention of reaching a compromise with the Soviet Union at the talks and that he had not been authorised to show flexibility in Geneva.

Answering a question from the media, Nitze amazed his audience by stating that the American side would make concessions at the talks if the Soviet Union met it halfway. However, he must have remembered a recent thrashing he had got in Washington because of the "liberties" he had taken in his public statements on the prospects of the Geneva talks, because he immediately retracted that statement and said instead that at best the American side would merely "examine any Soviet proposal."

Nitze did not make any slips during his meeting with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl in Bonn and firmly stuck to the view that the USSR should disarm unilaterally.

The hopes of certain Western observers that Washington will show goodwill at the talks in response to the latest Soviet peace initiatives have not yet been confirmed. Talk in Washington about the "relaxation" of the U.S. position in Geneva and revision of the U.S. approach to nuclear arms reductions seem today a forced tactical manoeuvre of the enemies of detente to gain time for launching a propaganda campaign in support of the notorious "dual decision" of NATO.

The odious pseudo zero option continues to underly the U.S. stand at the Geneva talks. In this situation the sincerity of the U.S. official spokesmen on their desire for the stabilisation of the situation in Europe only deserves a zero rating.

NOVIKOV CRITICIZES U.S. RESPONSE TO PACT PROPOSALS

LD260449 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1940 GMT 25 Jan 83

[From the "World Today" program presented by political observer Lev Novikov]

[Excerpts] Recently Eagleburger, deputy secretary of state of the United States for political affairs, visited Yugoslavia. There he gave an interview to the Zagreb magazine DANAS.

Replying to questions about the new proposals put forward at the Prague conference, this state official, who is prominent in the United States, stated in particular: The entire history of relations with the Soviet Union testifies to the fact that the USSR puts forward generalized agreements which are of no essential importance. For this reason, Eagleburger said, I believe that the recent proposals are of this nature also.

Well, we shall not start going back deep into history. Let us recall only that in 1949 the Soviet Government proposed that a peace pact be concluded between the five great powers. In 1958 the idea was put forward of signing a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries. In 1978 the Warsaw Treaty member-states proposed that a world treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations should be concluded. In 1980, quite recently, there followed a proposal to agree on no first use of both nuclear and conventional weapons against one another.

As is known, these drafts were rejected by the Western powers, in the first place by the United States, of course. It is precisely the United States which, also in the first place, did not want to follow the example of the Soviet Union, which took on the unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and, accordingly, brought pressure to bear on their allies in the Atlantic bloc.

After all, all Soviet proposals enumerated differ from the American ones in that they are specific, purposeful and meet the interests of peace and security of all states, not giving anyone the advantage. And, on the whole, are there in our time more concrete proposals aimed at strengthening detente and averting a nuclear catastrophe, than the new Soviet peace initiatives, announced by Comrade Andropov, or let us say, the historic Prague initiative of the Warsaw Pact member-states?

Let us take any proposal from this declaration. For example, the one for concluding a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the preservation of relations of peace between the member-states of the two military groupings, the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Is this not a concrete proposal? After all, it is not an accident that most countries, including European ones, regarded it with complete seriousness. On this score quite a few statements by political figures in various countries have already been cited by us.

As we can see, this view sharply disagrees with the irresponsible statements by some representatives of the White House. Is this not happening because the peace initiatives of socialism have, as before, taken the Washington politicians unawares? Washington, after all, as the facts show, in no way wishes to give up the idea of military superiority of the United States and NATO over the socialist countries. It is not fortuitous that the same Eagleburger stated that the American Government continues to insist on the production of MX missiles. According to him, this is necessary in order to retrieve the strategic balance, but in fact, as Comrade Gromyko noted at a press conference in Bonn, to achieve a situation where the zero would apply only to the Soviet Union.

Finally, let us see with what the American delegation is returning to the talks in Geneva. Its head, Paul Nitze, stated that he is going there with President Reagan's zero option. As is known, so far there has been no progress at the talks in Geneva and it will be difficult to move them forward if the American position of the notorious zero option is not changed.

In the present conditions one should not build one's security at the expense of the security of others. The principle of equality and equal security is a position which our country will not give up, as Comrade Gromyko also said in Bonn.

So, it is precisely the Warsaw Pact member-states who put forward a realistic [realnyy] alternative to the slide toward a nuclear catastrophe. And this, if one takes the stance of the Washington administration, is of no essential importance. Indeed, when arguments end, outright diplomatic tightrope-walking and pure lies begin.

But this can hardly mislead anyone. The French paper LE MONDE, for instance, cites the statement by Palme, the Swedish premier, to the effect that peace can be achieved through talks and not through bellicose statements. No one will be able to win a nuclear war. All will lose it.

KULIKOV INTERVIEWED ON DISARMAMENT TALKS

LD251034 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0215 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Berlin, 25 Jan (ADN) -- "The position on the first use or non-first use of nuclear weapons is at present so important that it is a yardstick for measuring the policy of every state as a whole," Marshal Viktor Kulikov, commander in chief of the joint forces of the Warsaw Pact member-states, said in an interview published on Tuesday by the BERLINER ZEITUNG.

Kulikov said that the majority of states and broad sections of world public opinion assessed the Soviet Union's decision on the renunciation of a nuclear first strike as an historical event in the struggle to avert a nuclear war. "The USSR's pledge contains 'nothing worthwhile' only in the eyes of those who have made preparations for a military conflict the basis of their policy, who aim at direct confrontation and who are willing, regardless of the consequences, to use nuclear weapons in a war. These politicians -- and they have openly declared themselves in the United States -- count on gaining the upper hand in war; for this reason they do not by any means regard it as a catastrophe. At present they have in mind the idea of preventative nuclear strikes," Marshal Kulikov said.

Concerning the newspaper's question on the position in the negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe, he said:

"The U.S. Administration representatives are in fact trying to create the impression among the West European public that discussions in the negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe are constructive and factual and that progress is being made. In reality -- and the Soviet Union as a participant in the negotiations states this openly -- nothing of the sort is taking place there. The United States has not in the slightest moved away from its original so-called 'zero option' and has incessantly tried to dictate its terms to the Soviet Union, terms which are compatible neither with its legitimate interests and the interests of its allies in the Warsaw Pact nor with resolving the task of limiting nuclear weapons in Europe."

"As is known the Soviet Union has submitted a proposal for limiting the nuclear potential of the two sides to one-third and, on a mutual basis, even totally renouncing types of weapons that are aimed at the destruction of targets in Europe -- both medium-range and tactical weapons."

"It cannot be disregarded that with the present ratio of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union offer a solution aimed at equal rights and raising security on both sides. They do not demand mutual [gegenseitige] disarmament from anyone and they do not make a claim for military superiority, but they do provide a radical solution to the problem of nuclear weapons in Europe," Marshal Kulikov stressed.

"From the military standpoint all U.S. medium-range weapons being moved forward to our borders actually extend the strategic nuclear potential of the United States based on the American Continent and aimed at the Soviet Union."

The Soviet Union will not, however, permit this. "The leadership of the Soviet state has already made it clear on numerous occasions that the USSR will find a way of responding to this threat. The balance will be restored, but at a higher level of nuclear weapons. The stationing of new U.S. missiles raises the nuclear threat for West Europe. "For this reason it is not a raising but a reduction in the level of military confrontation that must be carried out in this region. And the USSR has introduced important proposals to this end."

WESTERN OPPOSITION TO U.S. DISARMAMENT STANCE NOTED

LD231232 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2204 GMT 23 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, 23 Jan (TASS) -- The peace initiatives put forward in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member-states in Prague are simple, clear and comprehensible to all. They have aroused a favorable attitude not only among the broad masses of the people but also among politicians and statesmen in many countries. Statements and actions of Washington, which sets the pattern for NATO, are meeting with constantly growing anxiety about the future. Yuriy Zhukov emphasizes this in PRAVDA's international review.

It is evidently not by chance that the West European press, which only recently supported every step taken by the United States, is more and more often criticizing U.S. policies. Many Western Europeans and also U.S. newspapers have now openly admitted that the Soviet proposals set out by Yuriy Andropov on 21 December in his Kremlin report, envisaging radical nuclear arms reductions, are realistic. They have written that a number of officials of the U.S. Administration have supported a U.S. withdrawal from a deliberately unacceptable position, which attempts to achieve unilateral disarmament by the USSR, and have proposed that the United States go halfway to meet the Soviet proposals. But President Reagan does not wish to hear this.

In this situation Washington should not be surprised that the constantly strengthening antiwar movements in the United States and Western Europe are acquring an offensive character. While the U.S. President is consoling himself with the illusions that "pressure and resoluteness" can work together against the USSR in Geneva, he himself will have to encounter pressure of another sort this year.

NOVOYE VREMYA URGES SERIOUS APPROACH TO PACT OFFER

LD231154 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 23 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 23 TASS -- The new proposals made in recent speeches by Yuriy Andropov and in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member states embody a truly constructive, positive and life-asserting line in world politics. Their purpose is to ensure lasting peace and dependable security, the weekly NEW TIMES [NOVOYE VREMYA] writes. It notes that the proposals of the socialist countries lay emphasis on achieving not unilateral advantage but mutually acceptable decisions on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security, which alone can produce results at the talks. According to NEW TIMES, these proposals are both in form and in content an appeal to the West to come to terms on key issues of averting another war.

The position of the socialist community in international affairs, the article stresses, is absolutely clear in its sincereity, honesty and directness. It means the consolidation of the foundations of peaceful coexistence rather than their subversion, nuclear disarmament rather than nuclear deterrence, political cooperation rather than military confrontation, mutually beneficial business cooperation rather than trade and economic wars, the building of trust rather than the fomenting of antagonisms.

This is the stand of the socialist community, the weekly continues. The socialist countries have made concrete proposals and presented their ideas of ways and means of strengthening peace and preserving and extending detente. So they have every reason to expect the West to approach their views, ideas and plans with proper seriousness and responsibility, NEW TIMES concludes.

PETROV IN INTERVIEW DISCUSSES SALT ISSUES

AU241515 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 22 Jan 83 p 4

[Interview given by USSR General N. Petrov to APN's military commentator V. Morozov: "The Soviet Union Is Prepared; in Favor of Searching for a Sensible, Mutually Acceptable SALT Agreement"; date and place of interview not given; capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] [Question] Are there any objective criteria for comparing U.S. and USSR strategic weapons in view of their asymmetric structure?

[Answer] The structures of strategic weapons in the USSR and the United States differ. This follows from the two countries' different historical developments, in which one should take into account the different geographical and strategic positions of the country in question, its industrial technology and other factors. Ground-based ballistic missiles account for 70 percent of the USSR's strategic potential (if we count the number of warheads). On the other hand, 80 percent of the total U.S. strategic potential consists of ballistic missiles deployed on submarines and heavy bombers. In the present situation it is absolutely unrealistic to strive to achieve complete symmetry in the two countries' strategic forces.

[Question] Is it possible under these conditions to find an objective criterion for their comparison?

[Answer] Yes, it is. After all, this is confirmed by practice itself. For instance, in the fifties and sixties the United States spoke merely of its crushing supremacy. At the beginning of the seventies it already claimed that, substantially, the forces of the USSR and the United States were balanced. Understandably, such an assessment can be made only on the basis of comparing objective criteria. The experience acquired in Soviet-American talks proves that neither SALT I nor SALT II could have been achieved without the precisely formulated criteria on strategic forces, recognized by both sides.

THE CRITERION IN THE SALT I AGREEMENT WAS THE NUMBER OF LAUNCHING FACILITIES FOR BALLISTIC MISSILES DEPLOYED ON THE GROUND AND AT SEA. IN THE SALT II AGREEMENT THIS CRITERION WAS COMPLEMENTED BY THE NUMBER OF HEAVY BOMBERS, BY THE DEFINITION OF THE SUBLEVEL [poduroven] FOR MULTIWARHEAD CARRIERS AND BY THE ADOPTION OF JOINT MEASURES ON LIMITING THE NUMBER OF NUCLEAR WARHEADS ON EACH TYPE OF STRATEGIC CARRIER. The American side unconditionally agreed to these criteria. Moreover, in the case of SALT II the Americans wisely and reasonably suggested that the strategic arms be negotiated as a whole, comprehensively. At that time they told us that should these arms be considered piecemeal, then we would never come to an agreement -- because the comparison of nuclear forces part by part would create erroneous ideas about the nuclear potential of each country. The U.S. and USSR nuclear arsenals can be compared only as a whole, comprehensively.

The talks confirmed that comprehensive assessment, as well as the criteria for comparing strategic arms mentioned above, guarantee an objective picture of the distribution of mutual forces and are a good guarantee for checking on the fulfillment of the agreement. It is known that during preparations for SALT II we found a mutually acceptable solution which ensured both the equilibrium and the legitimate security of the two sides. After making detailed calculations both sides officially declared that the agreement guarantees an approximate equilibrium. Both sides also declared that strict adherence to the principles of equality and equal security is the unchangeable basis of talks between the United States and the USSR, as well as of mutual agreements.

[Question] Are both sides currently adhering to preceding approaches to the assessment of strategic arms?

[Answer] The Soviet Union does not, cannot, think that the work of many years connected with SALT is a thing of the past. Talks of this issue were conducted in a serious tenor and also yielded results. The SALT II treaty has not been ratified solely because the United States had violated the principle of equilibrium and equal security and embarked on the path of an arms race and of the acquisition of military supremacy over the USSR. By not recognizing SALT II at present (because it allegedly does not contain a significant reduction in the number of weapons), the American Administration is showing a lack of respect for the treaties it itself is signing. The SALT II treaty presumed that the USSR's strategic potential would be reduced by 10 percent (this represents 254 nuclear carriers several megatons strong); furthermore, it was presumed that the USSR would partly liquidate its ballistic missiles. Is that perhaps not a reduction? Substantial obstacles were being erected in the qualitative modernization of strategic arms. During the new talks it would be sensible to take into account all that was positive in SALT II. It is impossible to start anew from zero just because the American Government has changed. This is unproductive. As was said by Yuriy Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, the Soviet Union approaches the SALT talks with utter responsibility; it is searching for a just agreement that would not harm either of the interested sides and would simultaneously help achieve a reduction in their nuclear arsenals.

[Question] What are the USSR's specific proposals?

[Answer] FIRST, a comprehensive assessment of the two countries' nuclear potential; this means that the Soviet proposals include all kinds of strategic weapons without exception. SECOND, the Soviet Union has declared that it is prepared to cut down the strength of its strategic weapons by more than 25 percent. It demands the same thing from the United States so as to achieve equality between the two countries in the number of strategic arms carriers. The Soviet Union also proposes a substantial reduction in the number of nuclear warheads and a maximum limitation of the modernization of nuclear weapons. THIRD, as the first step, it suggests freezing the number of Soviet and U.S. strategic weapons and limiting their modernization.

[Question] What is the purpose of these proposals?

[Answer] By achieving a halt in the strategic arms races we will substantially lower the level of the opposed nuclear strengths while maintaining equilibrium; consolidate strategic stability; and, without impairing the security of the interested sides open the path toward achieving broader and deeper agreements in this sphere. THIS MEANS IN PRACTICE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONDITIONS WHICH WOULD EXCLUDE THE POSSIBILITY OF AN OUTBREAK OF NUCLEAR WAR. AND THIS IS THE EXACT PURPOSE OF THE SOVIET PROPOSALS.

[Question] And what is the United States proposing?

[Answer] It is rejecting its previous comprehensive approach and it proposes in practice to partly reduce the strength of strategic weapons. It is trying to prove that currently there is no equilibrium and that, allegedly, the Soviet Union has a supremacy because it is said to have more grand-based missiles. In the U.S. opinion, these missiles are causing an asymmetry in the strategic arms of the two sides and are therefore a "destabilizing factor" in Soviet-American relations. The United States maintains that the so-called real equilibrium and strategic stability can be achieved only after the problem of asymmetry is revolved in the first place -- that means, only if one starts rapidly reducing the number of ballistic missiles and, above all, liquidating the Soviet Union.

All these U.S. "arguments" are unsubstantiated. Thus, for instance, the UNITED STATES IS PROPOSING A REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF BALLISTIC MISSILES ON BOTH SIDES TO 850. AT FIRST GLANCE IT COULD SEEM THAT THIS IS A "RADICAL REDUCTION" WITH A SIMULTANEOUS MAINTENANCE OF EQUILIBRIUM. BUT THIS IS ONLY A FIRST GLANCE. THE RESULT OF WASHINGTON'S SO-CALLED RADICAL APPROACH WOULD BE THAT THE AMERICAN SIDE WOULD HAVE AT ITS DISPOSAL APPROXIMATELY 1,400 STRATEGIC CARRIERS, AND THE SOVIET UNION WOULD HAVE AT ITS DISPOSAL ALMOST 1.5 TIMES LESS [as published] STRATEGIC CARRIERS. THE UNITED STATES WOULD THUS ACQUIRE A TREBLE SUPREMANCY, ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF NUCLEAR CHARGES ON THESE CARRIERS.

But this is not all. To put it simply, the United States in practice is proposing to the Soviet Union that it liquidate its strategic missiles both on the ground and at sea, and replace them by the same number and same ratio of ground and naval missiles of the same strength and type and with the same number of warheads as the United States has. Apart from that, the United States would keep about 600 heavy bombers with long-range cruise missiles on board. One need not be a military expert to see the lack of logic and realism in the American stance.

[Question] What can be said about the other U.S. "arguments?" Wherein lies the main shortcoming of the American approach to the solution of the problem of strategic arms in your opinion?

[Answer] The thesis on the destabilizing properties of ground missiles is false; at the same time it represents an attempt to artificially acquire some kind of theoretical reason for supporting the American proposals. FROM THE MILITARY VIEWPOINT, STABILITY IS PRIMARILY ENDANGERED BY THOSE SYSTEMS WHICH ARE MOST EFFECTIVE IN DESTROYING THE DEFENSE WARNING SYSTEM, COMMAND POSTS, AND STAFFS AND THEIR COMMUNICATIONS, BUT WHICH DO NOT HAVE A SUFFICIENTLY RELIABLE COMMUNICATIONS WITH HEADQUARTERS -- THIS FACT ENHANCES THE PROBABILITY OF THEIR BEING USED WITHOUT APPROVAL -- AND WHICH REQUIRE SPECIAL OPERATIONAL MEASURES WHICH CAN AGGRAVATE TENSION (FOR INSTANCE THE TAKE-OFF OF HEAVY BOMBERS). According to these indexes, the most destabilizing means are the ballistic missiles deployed on submarines; heavy bombers armed with the stealth technology; long-range cruise missiles; and the Pershing II missiles deployed in forward positions.

The American side's claims about a violation of equilibrium in the USSR's favor are entirely without substances; this was convincingly stated by Dmitriy Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, in his interview with a TASS reporter. Even the facts published in the United States indicate that currently the USSR has, as the United States has, approximately 7,500 warheads on its ballistic missiles. But, as I have already stated, the United States has several times more heavy bombers than the USSR has. THUS, IF WE ARE TO SPEAK OF WHO HAS THE ADVANTAGE OF SUPREMACY IN THE SPHERE OF STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WARHEADS, WE MUST SAY THAT IT IS THE UNITED STATES AND NOT THE SOVIET UNION.

The main danger of the American position is that it in no way limits U.S. programs connected with the growth of strategic armament -- the MX and Trident II missiles, the new strategic bombers, cruise missiles. After all, this is proved -- among other things -- also by the growing U.S. expenditures for strategic nuclear forces. IF, IN 1979, THESE EXPENDITURES AMOUNTED TO $12.3 BILLION (CALCULATED ACCORDING TO THE CURRENT RATE OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE), THEY WILL AMOUNT TO $23 BILLION THIS FISCAL YEAR. For fiscal year 1983-84 one already reckons with $30 billion. This means that the arms race -- the real, main destabilizing factor -- will continue.

From this it follows that although Washington speaks of recognizing the urgency of limiting strategic arms, on the other hand, it is speculating with announcements about its being prepared for a "radical reduction." But the reality is different. The United States is trying to disrupt the existing equilibirum in its own favor and to acquire strategic advantages for itself. True, Washington is intimating that it will "negotiate with the USSR at the roundtable for as long as the possibility exists to limit armament." But these are mere words, which cover up a tactic of plotting and a destructive approach. THE WHITE HOUSE IS NOT PONDERING OVER HOW TO LOOK FOR A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS WITH REGARD TO REDUCING STRATEGIC ARMS, BUT OVER HOW TO FIND A FORMULA WHICH WOULD SEEM "JUST" TO THE UNINITIATED BUT AT THE SAME TIME BE UNACCEPTABLE TO THE USSR.

According to the declaration made by the Soviet leadership, the American proposals -- in the form formulated by Washington -- are not based on equal rights and cannot represent a foundation for working out an agreement. Equilibrium, equality and mutual security -- that is the only path which can, and must inevitably, be taken if we want to achieve an agreement on the SALT issues. It is this approach that is contained in the specific Soviet proposals. It is as Yuriy Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, has said: "WE ARE IN FAVOR OF EQUAL RIGHTS, OF CONSIDERING BILATERAL INTERESTS; IN FAVOR OF AN HONORABLE AGREEMENT, FOR THIS WE ARE PREPARED."

PACT PROPOSALS 'REALISTIC' APPROACH TO SECURITY

PM251511 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jan 83 Second Edition p 6

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences V. Petrov: "Realism in Politics: Words and Actions"; first paragraph is PRAVDA's introduction]

[Text] The complex nature of the present international situation urgently demands the speediest solution of the problems which are exacerbating relations between states. In this connection realism in politics and a realistic approach to urgent matters are of special significance.

Much has been said of late in Washington and in the other NATO capitals about political realism in general and in relation to Europe in particular. It is pretty clear, however, that what they often try to pass off as realism is the imperialist circles' effective disregard for the objective law-governed patterns of the modern world, their desire for military superiority, their imperial ambitions and adventurism, coercion and diktat. It goes without saying that this interpretation has nothing in common with a genuinely realistic approach to international problems.

The only realistic policy is one which is balanced and free from elements of expediency and emotion. Obviously, the successful conduct of a foreign policy course is impossible today without consideration of one's own interests and capabilities as well as those of other states.

If one follows the laws of logic when assessing the European situation it is perfectly clear that the prevention of nuclear conflict is something all states are interested in. Indeed, such a conflict is fraught with disastrous consequences for the whole world, above all for the European Continent which, in Pentagon and NATO plans, is allocated the role not only of a "nuclear magazine" but also of the most likely theater of hostilities. Suffice it to mention the theory of "limited" nuclear war preached in Washington.

The source of the threat to Europe and the whole world is not the Soviet Union, it is not its nonexistent "military superiority," as claimed by Western propaganda; it is the arms race imposed by the aggressive circles of imperialism and the fueling of international tension. The embodiment of this threat is the mountainous stockpiles of weapons. The reckless buildup of military arsenals may bring mankind to the brink of war. It hits the interests of peaceful cooperation and prevents the European countries, together with the other states of the world, from tackling such global problems as the development of the energy sector, nature conservation, exploration of the ocean and eradication of dangerous diseases.

As is known, rapid and profound changes are taking place in the development of military equipment. Qualitatively new types of weapons are being developed, above all weapons of mass destruction, and this may make control of them and, consequently, agreed limitation of them a difficult, if not impossible, task. Militarism is trying to play the part of Zeus. But in contrast to the mythical deity, it is seeking to abduct not Europa, daughter of King Agenor of Phoenicia, but the peace and security of the continent which bears her name.

In order to find a proper way out of the labyrinth of international problems, primarily in Europe, it is necessary to set about curbing the arms race and gradually reducing arms, which should eventually lower the level of military confrontation while preserving the existing approximate equality in the military sphere.

The main thing that the existing situation on the continent demands is, as the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee [PCC] conference notes, joint efforts to consistently implement the policy of detente, peace and disarmament. There is every reason for saying that the necessary prerequisites exist in Europe for making a definitive choice in favor of this approach.

The European states have seen for themselves the advantages which detente brings. There are among them no states whose interests would conflict with the process of preserving and augmenting the results of detente.

Despite the chill winds of the cold war which is being revived by certain people and the bellicose calls issuing from the camp of the opponents of detente, the material foundation for peaceful cooperation laid by the all-European conference in Helsinki remains. Since then interstate political contacts have become broader and fuller. Economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties have widened.

In Europe the paths which can lead to a real lowering of the level of military confrontation on the continent are clearly discernible.

The positive outcome of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe, whose next round starts 27 January, could break for all time the vicious circle of the buildup of nuclear arms on the continent. Otherwise, clearly, the Soviet Union and its allies will not be able to disregard the deployment of the qualitatively new U.S. nuclear missiles in West Europe which are intended for a first strike. In this case realism means both sides seeking to lower the level of nuclear confrontation.

As for the Soviet Union, it is prepared to take radical steps in that direction. As is known, the USSR has proposed ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. It has also presented another option whereby the USSR and the NATO countries reduce their medium-range armaments by more than two-thirds. This would mean that there would be no confrontation between Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles, that the USSR would keep only as many of these missiles as Britain and France have, not one more. This means that the Soviet Union would take out hundreds of missiles, including several dozen of the most modern missiles, which the West calls SS-20's. If the number of British and French missiles were to diminish in the future, the number of Soviet missiles would again be reduced by the same amount. As for the other nuclear weapon carriers -- aircraft -- the USSR advocates complete equality at a considerable lower level than at present.

The Soviet proposals offer the prospect of a practical solution to the question of limiting nuclear weapons in Europe. Only those who believe that there are "more important values" than the preservation of peace and life in the world could interpret them differently. Indeed, it should be clear that, in whatever way the nuclear tornado springs up, it is bound to get out of control and wreak universal disaster.

An important way to strengthen security on our continent is that of achieving an accord at the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The effective absence of progress at these talks is bound to cause anxiety, and rightly so. The NATO countries are clearly employing delaying tactics at them, using them as a screen for the buildup of their military potential, particularly in the center of Europe. How else can one explain the fact that these states rejected the proposal submitted by the socialist countries back in 1975 on freezing the numerical strength of the armed forces in the region while the talks were in progress? Since then the United States has increased its forces in the FRG by 35,000 men, and that at a time when the Soviet Union has unilaterally withdrawn from the territory of the GDR 20,000 of its servicemen, 1,000 tanks and other military equipment.

Nevertheless, the socialist countries at the recent Prague conference of the Warsaw Pact states' PCC put forward a new initiative geared to breaking the Vienna talks deadlock. They proposed as a practical step the reduction of Soviet and U.S. Armed Forces on the basis of mutual example. The reduction completed, the levels of the troops and armaments of the members of both military-political alliances would be frozen pending the reaching of an agreement on further, larger reductions.

By and large the path to detente in Europe is a continuation of the process initiated in Helsinki. It is no accident that the Madrid meeting of the states which participated in the all-European conference is focusing attention on military aspects of European security and the convening of a conference on measures to strengthen confidence and security and on disarmament in Europe. The Soviet Union's readiness to attend confidence-building measures to the entire European part of our country -- given a corresponding widening of the confidence measures zone by the Western states -- is a constructive step paving the way to the convening of a conference.

In the PCC's Political Declaration the Warsaw Pact states proposed, with a view to eliminating the division of Europe into opposing military groupings, the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the states of the two military-political groupings -- the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

The peace initiatives of the USSR and the other socialist community countries are evidence of their determination to do all they can for the strengthening of security in Europe, for the positive development of interstate relations on the continent and for the improvement of the entire world situation.

But, obviously, you cannot maintain a realistic stance, hoping for progress and for a normalization of the situation, if only one side is making the effort, if only one side is putting forward initiatives and proposals while the other side strives to avoid examining them. You cannot expect positive results if the other side fails to respond. It must be plainly stated that it is now up to the West to display the corresponding political will.

One of the main demands of political realism is not only to preserve existing forums for dialogue but, by conducting talks, to move ahead and achieve practical results. To accomplish this it is necessary both to abandon attempts to grab one-sided advantages and to find a generally acceptable balance of the interests of all sides.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the purpose of the talks with the United States and other Western powers, in particular on questions relating to curbing the arms race, is not to establish where we differ, said CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov. As far as the USSR is concerned, talks are a way of combining the efforts of different states to achieve results beneficial to all sides. The problems will not disappear by themselves if talks are held merely for the sake of talks, as often happens, unfortunately. To create a policy divorced from reality is an unproductive activity and it may bring Europe to the danger point.

Indeed, the realistic approach to the solution of the practical tasks on the agenda of European life and international life in general demands immediate measures to strengthen peace and detente. Europe can and must set an example of political realism in the interests of peace, in the interests of people living now and of future generations.

NATO, PACT STANCES ON EUROPEAN SECURITY CONTRASTED

PM251047 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[Article by V. Kuznetsov: "A Chance for Europe: Prague Declaration Proposes a Path Toward Lasting Peace"]

[Text] The international public has responded with warm interest to the peace call from Prague issued by Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee [PCC] conference. This call met with a special response in Europe, to which a special section of the conference's final document -- the Political Declaration -- is devoted.

Europe has become the cradle of detente in the postwar world. It has shown, on the basis of its own living example, that, however different their socioeconomic systems and ideology may be, states can take the path of cooperation in many spheres, including the political, economic and humanitarian. Having resolved the very complex territorial and political problems of the postwar settlement, Europe has shown that the guarantee of a secure future on the continent is represented by the absence of political and, even more so, military confrontation. These new trends of European life were enshrined in the Final Act of the all-European conference in Helsinki. Detente in Europe has become a very important factor cementing peace on a global scale.

"All European states have been persuaded, from their own experience, of the advantages which detente entails," the PRAGUE PCC conference Political Declaration points out. There are among them no states whose interests would not be met by the preservation and augmentation of detente's achievements."

However, certain circles are now trying to persuade West Europe otherwise -- of the "advantages" of stepping up military, including nuclear, confrontation, fueling political confrontation and curtailing mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation. They want to cast back a Europe which has experiences of good-neighborliness to the times of the cold war.

Rejecting detente was allegedly detrimental to U.S. interests. The present Washington administration is trying to impose its view as a common platform for all the other NATO members. And not just that. Official Washington is seeking to mobilize its allies to destroy everywhere the material foundation of the detente policy. The aim of the trans-Atlantic strategy is to knock the supports from under this policy: the military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO, and trade and economic cooperation between the European states. That is the aim of the present U.S. leadership with regard to detente. The intention is to undermine it precisely where it has the strongest roots, where it has achieved the greatest successes.

They want to turn the cradle of detente -- including the military detente born on the European Continent -- into a nuclear missile magazine, a firing range which, were a war to occur, would inevitably become the site of a conflagration. By installing with the aid of NATO's "modernization" plan a control panel for a "limited" nuclear war in Europe whose launch button will be pushed by the finger of the White House, the Washington administration is essentially planning to switch West Europe to a prewar regime, after forcing it to serve the interests of the U.S. global strategy.

The Warsaw Pact members believe that Europe is threatened with a very serious danger -- the implementation of the Washington-imposed NATO decision to deploy the new U.S. medium-range missiles on the territory of a number of countries. There is consequently the threat of a new cycle of the nuclear arms race.

There is the threat of the buildup of other types of mass-destruction weapons, such as chemical and neutron weapons, and a considerable buildup of conventional weapons. All this would lead to reduced confidence, the complication of interstate relations and a general deterioration in the situation on the continent.

It is planned to implement the adventurist undertaking of NATO's nuclear "modernization" under the phony U.S. slogan of "eliminating the Soviet monopoly in medium-range nuclear systems." It is with this slogan that some people in West Europe now intend to camouflage their participation on the anti-European, essentially global military strategy of NATO's "leader." In actual fact it is Washington, which lost its atomic monopoly some time ago, which is now seeking to restore its former superiority with the aid of a large-scale contingent -- almost 600 units -- of modern nuclear missiles. It is in Europe that it wants above all to realize this dream -- as obsessive as it is vain -- of the trans-Atlantic hawks of achieving military superiority. It is here, in this crucially important part of the world, that it intends to keep a nuclear big stick so as, by threatening to use it at any moment, to attempt to dictate its will to both East and West Europe.

Unfortunately, far from everyone in West Europe is yet aware of the possible consequences of the implementation of Washington's strategic design with respect to the old world. The Prague Political Declaration proposes that the European and world public weigh up the full measure of the danger threatening peace on the continent and beyond it, the full measure of the responsibility of those who are attracting this danger to Europeans and of those who voluntarily or involuntarily are conniving at these plans. For their part the Warsaw Pact states -- the Prague Political Declaration notes -- "consider the key task to be the prevention of the development of a new cycle of the nuclear arms race in Europe and to achieve the reduction and limitation of these arms. This is important for the consolidation of security in Europe, the positive development of interstate relations on the continent and the normalization of the entire international situation."

Seeking to ensure the stability of the military-strategic situation in Europe and the preservation and deepening of detente and of the entire positive balance of the seventies, the allied socialist states' highest leaders are proposing in the present acute situation a detailed package of urgent, effective measures. These are measures of a political, military, economic and humanitarian nature. In the opinion of those taking part in the Prague conference, their implementation would eliminate tension, weaken the threat of war and help to surmount the distrust in relations between states.

After noting the USSR's contribution made in its new proposals which open up a real prospect for resolving the question of medium-range nuclear arms limitation in Europe, the Warsaw Pact members advocated that the relevant talks in Geneva be conducted in a constructive spirit and that maximum efforts be made for the speediest attainment of specific accords. It is important that all interested European states facilitate headway in Geneva. It is important that nothing be done that might complicate the talks but that, on the contrary, steps be taken to promote the reaction of a favorable atmosphere for their progress.

The socialist countries' new proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the states belonging to the two military-political groupings -- the Warsaw Pact and NATO -- was a major action. Following the Soviet Union's unilateral pledge in June 1982 to renounce first use of nuclear weapons, this is yet another exceptionally fruitful -- in terms of its substance -- manifestation of the constructive goodwill of the USSR and the entire socialist community. It is a very promising initiative -- if the West treats it with appropriate seriousness. It opens up the opportunity to create a solid basis for more productive and trusting relations between states belonging to the two military-political groupings.

At the end of 1982 the Soviet Union proposed that the Warsaw Pact and NATO undertake not to extend the sphere of operation of the two alliances to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. As has frequently happened, NATO's response was silence. Now the USSR's proposal has become the joint proposal of the Warsaw Pact members. The "forgetful" have thus been reminded that it is now up to them to respond.

The necessary remiders were made in the Political Declaration for a number of other questions too which NATO would prefer to suppress or expunge from the records. But the initiators of these proposals do not intend to remove them from the agenda. In any case, the peace-loving public remembers them and is continuing to insist that they be treated very responsibly. What is envisaged is the resumption of talks on many aspects of the disarmament problem affecting in particular the fate of security in Europe and relating to the activity of the two military-political alliances -- talks which have been broken off through no fault of the USSR. Those taking part in the PCC conference urged the NATO countries to achieve a practical accord not to increase military expenditure and, subsequently, to reduce it in percentage or absolute terms. It was proposed that talks on this very important question be embarked upon immediately. It is an urgent necessity, the socialist states' highest leaders are convinced, that there be a discussion of the proposals to create nuclear-free zones in north Europe, the Balkans and other parts of the continent and to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and cooperation.

The Warsaw Pact members expressed themselves in favor of achieving a practical accord within 1-2 years at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The socialist states' leaders assign a special place to the fruitful completion of the Madrid meeting of representatives of the countries which took part in the all-European conference, and to the reaching of agreement to convene a conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe. This conference is intended to make a major contribution to easing military confrontation, reducing distrusts and resolving the questions of reducing armed forces and armaments in this part of the world.

In their European policy the socialist countries proceed from the premise that the present situation on the continent urgently demands mutual understanding and the pooling of the efforts of all states, large and small, and their concentration on the solution of key problems. Seeking broad collaboration with other states with a view to resolving these questions, the Warsaw Pact members advocate: maintaining and deepening political dialogue and consultations at all levels, the broadest possible political contacts and the development of contacts at all levels; the all-around expansion of businesslike cooperation in the trade, industrial, agricultural, scientific and technical fields without any discrimination, and confidence-building measures in economic relations; the intensification of the European people's mutual spiritual enrichment, the exchange of artistic values, the dissemination of truthful and honest information and the cultivation of feelings of mutual good will and respect.

The socialist states acted in Prague as the champions of surmounting the present dangerous tension, the champions of normalizing the European and world political climate and improving international affairs. Their Political Declaration contains a large, constructive charge of good will and very promising initiatives. This realistic specific action program, instilling optimism and the belief that the real alternative put forward in Prague to the slide toward nuclear catastrophe is gaining broad public support, will meet with the understanding of sober-minded circles in the West and will ultimately lead to lasting peace.

In assessing the present situation and its prospects in the light of the PCC conference results, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers believe that a practical opportunity is being opened up for halting the present dangerous development of events, diverting them into a healthy channel strengthening mutual trust and resolving, one after the other, the tasks of limiting and reducing the arsenals of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons.

And this chance must not be missed.

WESTERN OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS NOTED

LD252008 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 25 TASS -- TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev writes:

U.S. Vice-President Bush leaves for Western Europe this weekend. It follows from the U.S. press that his trip is taken in the framework of President Reagan's "experiment" in the sphere of so-called "public diplomacy" whose essence, as THE NEW YORK TIMES notes, is to give propaganda "combatting" to new Soviet initiatives on questions of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. These initiatives, as is known, open a realistic path to just agreements, not damaging the security of any of the sides, about radical reduction of nuclear arsenals, to the consolidation of mutual confidence and universal security.

The question of the need of considering most attentively the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty countries is raised in earnest in Western Europe. According to the public opinion survey held by NEWSWEEK in Western Europe, the United States' intention to turn Western Europe into a nuclear place d'armes and theatre of nuclear war is rejected most resolutely by 57 per cent of people polled in the FRG, 53 per cent in the Netherlands, 45 per cent in Britain and 43 per cent in France.

Broad circles of the public in the United States where 64 per cent of people come out for the freezing of the production of nuclear weapons as an initial step on the road to the reduction of the nuclear arms stockpiles, and broad public circles in Western Europe realise that the policy of arms build up conducted by the Reagan administration with a view to achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union is disrupting international stability. It is precisely this feeling of concern that prompts millions of Western Europeans when they hold demonstrations against the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in their lands, when they demand that the NATO leaders hold a sincere dialogue between the West and the East. But the Reagan administration, instead of an honest quest of the ways of nuclear arms limitation and reduction, exerts the efforts to dampen the wave of protests by the supporters of nuclear weapon ban and to discredit the new Soviet proposals.

THE WASHINGTON POST admits that the Reagan administration kept from serious attempts to go beyond the framework of the so-called "zero option". Moreover, according to the newspaper, the U.S. Administration so far has not even tried to work out the position for conducting in earnest serious talks with the Russians in Geneva about possible ways of limitation of the deployment of medium-range missiles.

During an interview to THE NEW YORK TIMES, when asked if he brings to Western European allies any new U.S. proposals in the sphere of nuclear arms or if the United States contines insisting on Reagan's "zero option", U.S. Vice-President Bush said that the United States awaits impatiently any "serious steps and proposals" that the Russians might make.

But the Russians have already made such proposals and they are on the table of NATO countries' governments. This, apparently, is the essence of Reagan's "experiment": not to see and not to hear what he is offered by the Soviet side. Therefore Bush goes to Western Europe empty-handed to find it more convenient to twist partners' arms.

UK JOURNAL WELCOMES SOVIET ARMS PROPOSALS

LD252202 Moscow TASS in English 2108 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] London January 25 TASS -- UNITY writes editorially:

A document was leaked to the press this week which shows the true intent of the United States' nuclear war policy. It was a budget draft for 1984-88 which was signed by Caspar Weinberger, the American defence secretary. It demands preparation to fight a protracted nuclear war, nuclear weapons in space, the "redressment of the balance of power in the Soviet Union if necessary without arms control", abrogating the anti-ballistic missile treaty, new medium-range missiles: new areas of military competition with the USSR, military support for China against the Soviet Union, open planning to use "theatre nuclear weapons" (i.e. in Europe) first.

These incredible items in an authoritative report cannot be repeated too often. They show clearly what U.S. nuclear strategy is about -- threatening the Soviet Union, its allies and anyone who is seen as a threat to the United States, with nuclear extinction.

They appear to have engineered the backing of two of Reagan's arms control negotiations [as received] on the suspicion of "going soft". Quite obviously if a negotiator is required to subscribe to the lunacy of this document, only criminals and madmen need apply for the job. It is this administration, by the way, which has just been given control of proposed cruise missiles in Britain -- the Thatcher government this week refused to ask for "dual key" control.

Contrast all this with the stream of positive peace proposals coming from the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty countries. Such is the reasonableness and the growing demands of the peace movement that given Reagan and Britain's foreign secretary, Francis Pym, have been forced to announce that they will be studied carefully. Note that Thatcher cannot even bring herself to make such a statement.

Yet there is nothing surprising in this contrast. It is not simply that the Russians are nice people and fervently want peace, true as that is. It is the nature of the social systems that makes the difference, there is no arms manufacturers lobby that makes enormous profits out of weapons of mass destruction in the Soviet Union. On the contrary, there is a powerful and vociferous lobby of ordinary people who see the money they are forced to spend on arms denying them some of the great advances in their material and spirtual well-being that would otherwise be possible.

This makes nonsense of the attitude of some people who claim to be peace activists who talk about "two equal superpowers". They spend much of their time trying to encourage the tiny minority of dissidents who call themselves peaceworkers in the socialist countries. An interesting article currently in the NEW STATESMAN was written by just such a person from Hungary as a reply to E.P. Thompson, he actually asked the Western peace movement to stop asking their governments for nuclear arms control! "Human rights" for warmongers such as he had to come first! The lesson should be well learnt that peace is a fundamental policy of socialism. Those who fight against those governments deserve to have their claims to be in favour of peace well-tested before they are taken seriously.

PRAVDA CRITICIZES FRG PAPER'S ARMS 'INSINUATIONS'

LD251609 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, 25 Jan (TASS) -- In its 26 January issue PRAVDA publishes the following editorial article [redaktsionnaya statya] entitled "The Truth Will Out."

The Soviet Union's constructive position on the issue of limiting nuclear weapons in Europe is meeting with a broad response among the West European and U.S. public. This position opens up an opportunity for achieving an honest, just accord at the Geneva talks.

However, as is evident, this is precisely what does not suit certain U.S. and NATO circles. All they can think of is the notorious "zero option" which is aimed at the unilateral disarming of the Soviet Union. They are giving a hostile reception to the Soviet initiatives that bar the way toward continuing the arms race; they are trying to distort them and present them in a false light. Moreover they do not shun downright unfair tricks of the lowest kind.

Thus the Springer group newspaper BILD ZEITUNG disconcerted its readers only the other day with the report alleging that the Soviet SS-20 missile is not a medium-range weapon at all but an intercontinental missile tested for a distance of 8,000 km. The Springer group newspaper even found an 'expert' to back its inventions. This is Todenhoefer, a not unknown figure in the CDU [Christian Democratic Union], who has more than once been caught making similar anti-Soviet insinuations.

Why does the BILD ZEITUNG invent such nonsense? After all it is know that the Soviet SS-20 missile is a medium-range weapon. It is also known that in the event of an accord with the United States these missiles, over and above the numbers agreed upon for Europe, will not be deployed nearer than that boundary in Siberia from which they would be able to reach targets in West Europe. Moreover, Soviet medium-range weapons cannot reach U.S. territory in any circumstances. In this lies their fundamental difference from American medium-range weapons, which from the region of Europe can reach a great distance into the territory of the Soviet Union.

However BILD ZEITUNG is not searching for the truth; its main aim is to blacken the Soviet proposals and to confuse gullible or ill-informed people. It is not by chance that this unseemly work is being carried out precisely by a newspaper of such a type as BILD ZEITUNG.

A lie has short legs, and BILD ZEITUNG will not get far on them. It is very well known both in the United States and other NATO countries that the SS-20 missile has never flown either 5,000 or 8,000 km. In questions connected with the limitation of nuclear weapons, there is a reliable source of truth -- national technical means of control; these clearly show where the truth lies and where invention lies, which is aimed at sabotaging agreements on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD211818 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 21 Jan 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Valeriy Kosovan, all-union radio foreign political commentator; with Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Shishkin, TASS political observer; Igor Petrovich Belyayev, international affairs journalist; and Konstantin Ivanovich Semenov, candidate of history]

[Excerpt] [Kosovan] As usual we have received many letters from people showing an interest in the state of Soviet-American relations and who are asking about the Reagan administration's policy concerning nuclear disarmament. Listeners Tyutrin from Orekhovozuyevo, Tyatov from Krasnoyarsk, Zarygina from Tikhvin, Filatova from Belovo in Kemerovo Oblast, Sorokin from Milodechno and many others refer to these topics in their letters.

Esteemed comrades, Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Shishkin, TASS political observer, replies to your questions. Gennadiy Arkadiyevich for many years headed the TASS office in the United States. He knows that country very well; he saw the rise and fall of many U.S. politicians. Therefore, the first question I would like to ask Gennadiy Arkadiyevich is linked primarily with the changes in the top echelons of power in Washington. Observers are linking them directly with the latest fiascos in the White House's foreign and domestic policies. And so, here is the question: Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, what was the reason for the dismissal of Eugene Rostow, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency?

[Shishkin] Indeed, this episode attracted the close attention not only of the U.S. but also the Western European public, primarily because Rostow was removed from his post under pressure from the most reactionary people surrounding Reagan, people who generally oppose any reductions in strategic arms. The question arises: How did Rostow displease the U.S. hawks, since he himself is by no means a dove? Rostow is widely known as an official who sides with the rightwing of the Democratic Party and as an advocate of the so-called power approach to foreign policy. Those who think like he does, belong to the camp of U.S. neoconservatives who gave a hostile reception to the detente policy and did everything in their power to bury it. Rostow is one of the founders, and a former chairman, of the notorious Committee on the Present Danger which was set up specifically with the aim of opposing the conclusion of a treaty on the limitation of strategic arms.

[Kosovan] Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, why has a man with such a solid hawkish reputation proved unacceptable for the Reagan hawks?

[Shishkin] Replying to this question, many Western observers note that the socialist countries' broadly based peace offensive has caught the Reagan administration unaware. Stubbornly clinging to its "zero option," Washington was completely unprepared for this. Meanwhile, as the Paris LIBERATION stressed, having announced new initiatives, the Soviet Union moved to the forefront of the peace race. In the face of Moscow's peace offensive, writes LIBERATION, the countries of the Atlantic treaty found themselves in a position where they simply no longer could systematically reject all proposals that were put forward.

In the view of the THE NEW YORK TIMES, in these conditions Rostow could not help but make an attempt, albeit timid, to get the Geneva negotiations on the limitation of medium-range nuclear arms in Europe off the ground, thus departing from Reagan's so-called "zero option" which boils down, as is known, to unilateral disarmament by the Soviet Union. This makes its utter hopelessness as regards a possibility of reaching agreement quite obvious.

To start with, the Reagan administration, while indignant at Rostow's attempt, did not dare reshuffle the leadership of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for fear of a negative reaction on the part of Western European countries. In this context, even THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote that the latter are expressing ever increasing dissatisfaction with the United States' stubborn adherences to the "zero option."

However, seeing the Soviet initiatives gaining more and more support throughout world and watching how, in the words of THE NEW YORK TIMES, they were received with keenest interest in Western Europe, particularly in the FRG, Washington subsequently hardened its position more and more.

In the testimony of the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT magazine, the Pentagon was particularly zealous in opposing any proposals that might have watered down Reagan's "zero option." And then, in the testimony of THE WASHINGTON POST, Rostow sent a memorandum to Secretary of State Shultz in which he complained that the plenary powers of Nitze, the head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva negotiations, were very limited, he was notified that the President was dismissing him. THE WASHINGTON POST stresses that this entire episode, gives rise to suspicion that the Reagan administration is not striving for an agreement, and is only creating the impression that it is participating in negotiations in order to win time for building up U.S. military might.

[Kosovan] Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, having got rid of Rostow, the Washington administration has however not only not got rid of unpleasant problems, but has created new ones which are even more serious. Reagan has been accused, both in the United States itself and, particularly, in Western Europe, that he has washed his hands of the affair and handed over control of the administration's work to a group of advisers from the ultraconservative camp who are so dazzled by their anti-Sovietism that they cannot see with sufficient clarity the real problems that are facing the United States.

[Shishkin] This has alarmed Reagan's entourage and it has started organizing a series of measures to restore the President's image as a strong leader. Reagan himself hastened to hold an unscheduled news conference with the aim -- as he himself stated -- of dispersing the impression that complete confusion reigns in the White House in matters concerning arms limitations and negotiations with the Soviet Union. It is very noteworthy that during the news conference the President was told to his face: One gets the impression that disorder reigns here in the White House, that you have lost contact with reality and that your President is doomed to failure. Naturally, Reagan did not agree with such an assessment. He maintained that the reshuffle in the leadership of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was carried out in order to obtain a well-coordinated team to continue the negotiations.

[Kosovan] Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, I would like to mention in this context that one of the measures which is supposed to help to restore the prestige of the Washington administration is President Reagan's decision to dispatch Vice President Bush to Western Europe on 30 January for meetings with leaders of seven Western European countries and the Vatican. Could you dwell on the aims of this tour?

[Shishkin] The official aims of Bush's trip are consulting and coordinating the United State's position with its allies with regard to the new Soviet initiatives. The unofficial but actual aim is an attempt to sabotage the socialist countries' peace initiatives. THE WASHINGTON POST writes quite frankly about this, saying that White House spokesmen have declared that Bush's trip is intended to counteract both the movement against nuclear weapons which is spreading in Western Europe and the effect on Western European public opinion of the Soviet Union's recent proposal. The Reagan administration would clearly like to bury both the proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the Warsaw Treaty member-states and NATO, and the proposals for far-reaching reductions of strategic armaments for the United States and USSR and of medium-range nuclear missile deliveries in Europe.

This is precisely what the well-known American journalist Kraft had in mind when he declared that the words of the Reagan administration's peacemaking declarations to all appearances are intended not so much to ensure the success of negotiations with Moscow as to keep the peace supporters quiet. With the ill-informed in mind, Washington continues to assert that the United States is allegedly adopting a flexible position at the Geneva talks and is proposing that the entire class of land-based medium-range missiles be scrapped.

However, as is convincingly shown by a specific analysis of the actual situation, this so-called "zero option" of Reagan's in effect amounts to unilateral scrapping only of Soviet missiles -- leaving entirely intact the ballistic missiles of Britain and France, which are members of NATO, as well as the aircraft belonging to the medium-range class of weapon. As a result of this sort of "reduction," as Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR's foreign minister, said at his news conference in Bonn that NATO would obtain a 2 to 1 superiority over the USSR in the number of carriers and a 3 to 1 superiority in the number of nuclear warheads.

[Kosovan] The facts do indeed indicate what while talking about reductions, Washington is actually striving to continue and even to buildup the arms race with the aim of obtaining unilateral advantages.

[Shishkin] This also applies to the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons, during which the United States presents proposals which would lead to a disproportionately large reduction in the Soviet land-based nuclear forces. Those weapons to which the United States is particularly attached, namely cruise missiles -- or ballistic missiles launched from submarines -- are arbitrarily described as "less destabilizing" and therefore, are either not to be subject to reduction at all or the reduction is to be of a sort that would leave the corresponding American military programs intact.

As a counter to this unrealistic approach, the Soviet Union introduced a whole series of far-reaching proposals during the talks in Geneva. Our country is ready to have exactly the same number of missiles as Britain and France have in the European zone and to reduce everything else in Europe, including the most up-to-date Soviet missiles. The Soviet Union has also agreed to the establishment of equal levels in the corresponding aircraft. As for strategic weapons, in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security, the Soviet Union considers that all forms of strategic weapons should totally be limited and reduced -- of course, in such a manner that neither side should obtain any advantage from this to the detriment of the interests of the security of the other and that a really reliable barrier should be set up against the nuclear arms race.

This constructive policy of the Soviet Union's enjoys increasing support throughout the world. The planet's peace-loving forces sincerely welcome the alternative to a nuclear disaster proposed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Wide support is also accorded to the socialist countries' call for international cooperation for the sake of preserving civilization and life on earth. Sensible political and public figures, peace supporters, participants in the anti-war movement, agree with the socialist countries that there is currently no task more important for people than to preserve peace and to halt the arms race. It is the duty of all governments and all statesmen who determine policies in their countries to solve this task. [Passage omitted in which Kosovan defines the shadow cabinet in the British parliamentary system, Belyayev speaks on Israeli complicity in the Sabra and Shatila massacres, Kosovan gives a brief history of the Boer settlers in Africa, Semenov explains the nature of referenda and public opinion polls, and he concludes by answering a question on a German war criminal.]

PRAVDA VIEWS WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM251401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[Untitled "International Review" by Yuriy Zhukov]

[Text] This week too the central salient in the constantly intensifying political struggle of the forces of peace against the forces of war has been the well-considered, effective actions of the peace-loving states and public movements whose aim is to halt the arms race -- particularly the nuclear arms race -- and the race in other types of weapons of mass annihilation. This was the first question on the agenda of the important bilateral meetings bewteen statesmen among which the world press has particularly highlighted the visits by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, to the FRG and the GDR. These actions were discussed within the framework of the disarmament committee which has resumed its work in Geneva. Many mass demonstrations by members of antiwar movements have been devoted to them.

Two Approaches

Commenting on the development of the events taking place in the international arena, the world press is animatedly discussing the two approaches toward the problem of nuclear arms limitation and reduction -- a vitally important problem for all mankind.

On the one hand there is the peace offensive of the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries who are advancing specific initiatives opening the way to halting the arms race on the basis of the principle of parity and equal security. On the other, there are the impulsive, unconsidered actions of the United States and its NATO allies who are now muttering hypocritical words about their love of peace, now openly stating their intention to achieve military superiority at any price.

This week the fundamental differences in the approaches of the USSR and the United States toward the arms limitation problem again made themselves felt. Addressing a White House press conference, President R. Reagan stated that "the factors which are vitally necessary for achieving success in the arms control field are means of pressure (!) and determination." The President confirmed the former U.S. stance aimed at attaining military superiority.

A directly opposite stance was set out at the press conference in Bonn by A.A. Gromyko. "The USSR," he said, "does not want to put itself in a position of advantage, but the principle of parity and equal security is the holy of holies, from which it cannot deviate. We believe that other states should not deviate from this principle either."

Naturally, the peace initiatives put forward in the Warsaw Pact states' Political Declaration in Prague, simple, clear and comprehensible to all, are generating a favorable attitude not only among the broadest people's masses but also in the circle of politicians and statesmen in many countries, while the statements and actions of Washington, which sets the tone in NATO, are being greeted with mounting fears for the future.

And it is obviously no accident that the West European press, which only recently supported any U.S. step, is increasingly frequently criticizing U.S. policy. For instance, here is what the London newspaper THE SUNDAY EXPRESS writes: "Washington's reaction to Yu.V. Andropov's proposals was so muddle-headed, so politically stupid, that it has led to very great strain in relations within NATO."

And here is how West Europe assesses the USSR's policy against this background -- I quote the influential U.S. newspaper THE LOS ANGELES TIMES: "West Europe has formed the impression that the Russians are the champions of arms control and that Washington is not."

Many West European and indeed U.S. newspapers have now openly admitted that the Soviet proposals providing for a radical reduction in nuclear arms set forth by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov on 21 December in his report in the Kremlin are realistic. They have written that a number of officials in the U.S. Administration have advocated that the United States renounce its deliberately unacceptable position which envisages attempting to achieve the USSR's unilateral disarmament, and go halfway to meet the Soviet proposals. But President Reagan does not want to hear of it.

In this situation Washington should not be surprised that the constantly strengthening antiwar movements in the United States and West Europe are acquiring an offensive nature. While the U.S. President is nurturing illusions that "pressure and determination" can work in Geneva against the USSR, this year he himself will have to encounter pressure of a different kind.

"Public opinion polls in Britain," CBS correspondent T. Fenton stated, "Show that 65 percent of the population is opposed to the new U.S. missiles. In the FRG 61 percent of the population opposes them.... The question of the deployment of U.S. missiles is now resolved equally at the conference table and on the streets of the European cities."

There can be no doubt that the further they advance, the more powerfully and vigorously the peace champions will wage this struggle.

Who Needs Unsolicited Protectors?

Meanwhile in the east African and Southwest Asian countries a wave of protests is mounting against the military plans, announced in Washington on New Year's eve without a trace of embarrassment, in accordance with which the 19 states in this vast region are declared to be a "zone of U.S. national interests."

The time has passed when U.S. Secretary of State Dulles, relying on reactionary regimes, cobbled them together into blocs which served as a bulwark for the United States in zones it had selected. Now, in its expansionist aspirations, the United States has to count solely on its own armed forces, unless you count Israel, which is prepared for any military adventure. That is why the Pentagon has created a special "Central Command" for this region and put approximately 250,000 soldiers and officers at its disposal.

The U.S. generals are attracted most of all by the smell of oil wafting from the Arabian peninsula. As the Indian General (I.A. Vyasa) rightly noted on Monday in an article published by the INDIAN EXPRESS, these gentlemen are worried that the countries on which they are foisting their military presence are anxious not about the mythical "Soviet threat," which does not exist, but about the natural process of the liberation struggle of these countries' peoples. That is why the United States is hastening to transfer its troops, ships and aircraft to the "forward bases" it has obtained from several Asian and African states.

"However," the Indian general writes ironically, "the Persian Gulf countries are unenthusiastic about their presence." He rightly warns the unsolicited protectors of Southwest Asia and east Africa that "with the use of U.S. troops, the position will be aggravated still further and an explosive situation will be created."

As always in such cases, the U.S. ideological warfare services are trying to justify the Pentagon's latest military scheme -- which is being implemented in the interests of U.S. imperial policy -- by wailing about how Soviet tanks are allegedly on the point of streaming unrestrained across Iran into this enormous region and seizing it. The Mozambique newspaper NOTICIAS supplied a good answer to such ravings this week.

"The people of the continent," the newspaper reminded (its readers), "realize that the flurry of Western propaganda about the Soviet Union's aggressiveness is designed to justify the arms race which Washington has unleashed and the buildup of U.S. military presence in the developing countries. Independent Africa has advocated and continues to advocate peace and stability and does not want to tolerate the existence of foreign military bases on its land."

The Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA expressed itself in the same spirit on 19 January. It sounds the alarm over the expansion of the network of U.S. military bases in the Indian Ocean region, particularly in Australia.

The AAPSO Permanent Secretariat, which operates in Cairo, has resolutely denounced Washington's new hegemonistic designs. In its protest against the predatory U.S. plans, it stated in particular that the decision taken in the White House means that the United States is grossly flouting the peoples' sovereignty and national independence and ignoring their right to decide their fate independently.

There can be no doubt that the peoples of southwest Asia and east Africa, seeing this new threat to their freedom and independence, will do everything to deal a firm and resolute rebuff to their unsolicited U.S. protectors. The routine conference of leaders of the nonaligned states to be held in New Delhi will not be able to bypass the flagrant and unprecedently impudent stance of U.S. imperialism which, clearly overestimating its own strength, believes that it has total freedom of action.

Where Is Japan Being Pushed?

A few more words about an important event which occurred in Washington this week. Within the framework of its imperial policy the United States pays great attention to attempts to use its far eastern ally, Japan, as an obedient executor of the Pentagon's military plans.

The present leaders of Japan, which has now become the capitalist world's second-ranking country in economic terms, are prepared to intensify their armaments, although the Japanese Constitution not only rules out the possibility of warfare but even bans the creation of ground, naval, and air forces.

However, in compensation for this step, the Japanese Government would like to obtain substantial economic concessions from the United States. In particular it is a question of the United States not hindering the sale of Japanese goods, including automobiles, on the internal U.S. market and not foisting its own goods on Japan.

Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone's visit to Washington this week was devoted to a discussion of all these questions. Tokyo prepared very carefully for it. In an attempt to win over the Reagan administration, the Japanese Government announced an increase in its military expenditure, gave its consent to handing over to the United States its ultramodern technology for use for military purposes, and agreed to render economic aid to the U.S. satellite of South Korea totalling an enormous sum -- $4 billion.

Nonetheless, Nakasone had a very cool reception in Washington. He was told that the 6.5 percent increase which Japan has made to its military budget is "insufficient" and it was demanded that Japan "take action more rapidly" to step up its military preparations. The prime minister was told that the United States expects Japan to "share the responsibility for defending" an enormous region of Asia, the Pacific and the Far East.

As for economic problems of vital importance to Japan, Nakasone's interlocutors high-handedly demanded that he restrict the export of automobiles and other commodities to the United States yet at the same time not obstruct the access of U.S. output, primarily agricultural output, to the Japanese market.

At the end of difficult talks, Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone stated that "friction persists" in relations between the United States and Japan and that many figures in the two countries "are anxious about their present state." His spokesman at a Washington press conference said that the United States should understand that there are things which Japan "can do and things which it is unable to do" when it considers its own interests and the political situation in the country and the "enormous internal difficulties."

It would, however, be wrong to think that everything will end there. The U.S. Administration has no intention of considering the Japanese Government's objections and is fully determined to insist on having its own way. THE WASHINGTON POST, mentioning that a demand was made that Japan extend the sphere of its preparation for military activity to a radius of at least (!) 1,000 miles from Japanese shores, reported that a Pentagon delegation would visit Tokyo soon "to study the question."

Nor can we fail to consider that these demands are meeting with support among Japanese military circles which, of course, are linking their own plans with the scheme for the country's militarization -- the defeat in World War II obviously taught them nothing. That is borne out by the statement made at a Tokyo press conference by National Defense Agency Director Tanikawa concerning the plan "to begin as soon as possible, if possible this month, a joint Japanese-U.S. study of questions of the defense of sea lanes."

All this is forcing the peace-loving public in Japan and its neighbors to put the legitimate question: Where is Japan being pushed and where might it be led by the path being pointed out by the Pentagon?

These are important events which we have witnessed this week. The international situation remains complex and dangerous. All the more important significance attaches to the persistent, purposeful struggle of the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries whose aim is to erect an insuperable barrier against war and to return the development of events to a normal channel -- the channel of detente and mutually advantageous cooperation.

The Warsaw Pact states' Political Declaration touching on the most diverse aspects of international life remains the focus of world politics. Special attention is being attracted everywhere by their proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force between the Warsaw Pact and NATO states. As A.A. Gromyko noted during his official friendly visit to the GDR, its foundation should be the undertaking of the members of the two alliances to renounce the first use of nuclear and conventional weapons against each other.

The U.S. and NATO capitals did not venture to dismiss out of hand this proposal which is encountering deep sympathy among all peoples. They are reiterating from time to time their intention to "study it in depth," but time brooks no delay, especially as the United States and its allies are increasingly intensifying the arms race.

All the more significance attaches to the struggle which is being mounted increasingly extensively by the mass antiwar movements resolutely demanding an end to this senseless race.

EAST-WEST VIEWS ON ARMS LIMITATION TALKS

LD242304 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Jan 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Georgiy Zukov]

[Text] Hello, comrades: How often people say that today nobody fails to take an interest in international politics. People have always followed what is going on in the world, but now the role of international relations has grown beyond measure. More than ever before it is on these relations that the fate of the peoples as well as of each person as an individual depend. Humanity is currently living through a complex situation. Mankind is faced with a very acute dilemma: confrontation or cooperation; whipping up hostility or searching for mutual understanding.

With special interest we open the papers in the mornings, listen to the radio and follow television programs daily seeking in them an answer to the most important, the most burning issue of our time. What new steps have been achieved for the consolidation of peace and for the curbing of the arms race? Yes, now is the time that to a large degree it is being decided whether or not European security will be preserved or whether there will be a strengthening in the level of nuclear confrontation and a dangerous growth in instability and tension in Europe.

The Soviet side is doing all that is possible in order to save peace. The position of our country was clarified once again during a visit to Bonn by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs. During meetings with the leaders of the FRG and with the leaders of various political parties, Comrade Gromyko paid particular attention to the problem of restriciting nuclear arms in Europe, stressing that the Soviet Union is ready to radically reduce its medium-range nuclear weapons in the European zone -- including the most modern missiles -- and agrees to have exactly as many missiles as Britain and France. The Soviet Union also agrees to establish equal levels for the appropriate aircraft. The Soviet Union favors Europe being, in the final analysis, free from nuclear weapons, both medium-range as well as tactical.

The attention of the FRG leaders was drawn to the new major initiative of the Warsaw Pact member-states and to their proposal to the NATO member-states to conclude an agreement on the mutual nonuse of military force and maintaining relations of peace.

The Soviet Union firmly takes the position that despite all the differences of state, social structures and ideologies with West European countries, including the FRG, we have a wide community of interests of a long-term nature. It is worth remembering that at the beginning of the 1980's, the trade turnover between Western Europe and the member states of CEMA was ten times greater than the volume of trade between the United States and these countries. The fulfillment of orders for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries maintains about 2 million jobs in Western Europe. Taking part in trade with our country are 1,500 West German firms, 600 Finnish firms and 300 Italian firms.

What is there to interfere with the development of these good-neighborly relations, the increase of trade exchanges, the deepening of joint scientific research or the expansion of tourism? Judging by events and facts like the secret Pentagon report which the American UPI information agency reported on and in which a plan has been worked out for conducting a protracted nuclear war with the Soviet Union counting on a victory. The world is becoming more and more convinced that the cause of the aggravation of the international situation is in the first place the aggressive policy of the American Administration.

On 27 January the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe will begin again in Geneva. After all the new Soviet proposals, a lack of success in the talks is only possible in the event of a lack of a desire to reach an agreement, as Comrade Gromyko stressed during his recent visit to Bonn -- a lack of desire, naturally, on the American side. In Bonn, Comrade Gromyko expressed the hope that the Federal Government, the political parties -- regardless of their role today in the government of the state -- and the whole of the West German public would be able to soberly evaluate the situation taking shape and do all that is necessary to avert the danger of a nuclear arms race in Europe.

WESTERN PROPAGANDA ON PIPELINE WORKERS REFUTED

LD211436 Moscow TASS in English 0713 GMT 21 Jan 83

["Pravda: Canard Over the Pipeline" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 21 TASS -- PRAVDA carries a retort to Western propaganda, exposing its shameless lies that prison labour is used to build the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod pipeline. "Trying to give this concoction a semblance of truthfulness, those pen-pushers give a number of names of such 'builders'," the newspaper observes.

"That was how Zinovyy Mikhaylovich Krasivskiy has been made a 'builder' of the gas pipeline. He lives in the Lugovskiy community of the Khantiy-Mansi region, rather far from the route of the pipeline. The newspaper TYUMENSKAYA PRAVDA which has found him, writes that he has a good life and is fond of outings in the wood with his photo camera." He is fond of stories and has heard many in his life but never such a tall one as that floated by the Western media. "Meanwhile, it is in 'defence' of his human rights that the reactionary press is hysterically raising a hue and cry and that radio voices are moaning," the newspaper continues.

"Western propaganda has counted no fewer that 100,000 such 'builders' at the construction of the pipeline," PRAVDA writes. "Presumably, they have nightmarish working and living conditions, penned up in camps along the entire route of the pipeline. What horror!"

"The names of three more unsuspecting residents of the Tyumen region have been used by Western newspapers and radio broadcasters." "They are Aleksandr Vasiliyevich Usatykh, married, who lives in the Ishim district and is engaged in most ordinary occupations, his household and vegetable garden. Yuriy Leonidovich Grimm lives near Tyumen and works in a housing management office there. One more 'builder' of the gas pipeline works in the Isetskiy district. One look at themap of the region will convince anyone that each of them lives not closer than 100 kilometers from the route of the pipeline."

"Meanwhile, one canard after another is floated from the Western capitals," PRAVDA writes in conclusion.

MOSCOW NEWS ANALYZES ENERGY USE, OPEC PROBLEMS

LD241218 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 24 Jan 83

[From "The Way We See It" program]

[Text] Energy consumption in the world has tripled in the last 30 years and the use of oil and gas has risen 6 times over, but despite this trend the Organization of Oil Exporting Countries -- the OPEC -- has recently been having some serious problems on the market. Those problems are analyzed in the weekly MOSCOW NEWS. Now here are the details.

A number of difficulties have been caused by the economic crisis in the West, the longest crisis in the 22 years of OPEC's existence. Stagnation in industrial output in Western countries and slow industrial growth in developing countries have radically reduced the demand for oil from OPEC nations. For the 2d year in a row these troubles threaten to bring down prices. Symptomatically many importers are trying to empty their oil reserves in hope of getting more oil in the future at lower prices.

In contrast to this problem mostof the others have been artificially created for OPEC by transnational corporations in the West. For instance, these corporations have stepped up attempts to undermine the position of OPEC with oil from sources the organization has no control over. The sale of oil extracted from the North Sea, mainly by American and British monopolies, has increased in recent years by about 20 million tons. At the same time, Western countries are getting more oil from developing countries that don't bring to OPEC, taking advantage of their economic difficulties. Last year alone American corporations managed to increase the imports of such oil by more than 1/3, up to 50 million tons a year.

In 1982 the export of oil from OPEC countries dropped by about 15 percent in comparison with 1980. This means that these countries lost about $50 billion, that is twice as much as the official economic assistance the West gave all developing countries in 1981.

To protect their economies from such negative processes, OPEC countries have a system of quotas on extracting and exporting oil depending on the demand on the world market. If the quotas are unanimously approved and followed strictly, the interests of the OPEC countries cannot be seriously threatened by the economic crisis or the activity of transnational corporations. After all, they own 75 percent of all known sources of oil outside the socialist world. However, in the last 1 and 1/2 to 2 years there has been a war between Iraq and Iran, who are members of OPEC, and there have also been aggravated differences between the Arab countries over the pro-Israeli Camp David agreements imposed by Washington. Because of all this friction OPEC's chances of coming to unanimous decisions on quotas declined considerably.

The contradictions within OPEC, the disputes over quotas, pose a serious threat to the organization's existence. Meanwhile, it is obvious that because of the common economic interests of the OPEC countries all of them should be above their political, religious, territorial differences.

MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION URGED

LD141350 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT 14 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS -- "In developing cooperation with newly-free countries, the Soviet Government does not attach any political or any other strings detrimental to national sovereignty. It strictly abides by the principle of non-interference into internal affairs," writes in the January issue of the journal INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS [MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN] Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations Iliodor Kulev.

The author of the article points out that "in the past 25 years the USSR's economic and technical cooperation with developing states increased 12.7 times. In the current five-year period (1981-1985) it is planned to grow by 40 per cent as compared with the previous five-year period. The number of countries with which the Soviet Union conducts economic and technical cooperation on the basis of inter-state agreements increased from 18 in 1970 to 70 in 1981". 1,700 industrial enterprises, electric power stations and other projects were built with the help of the USSR in newly-free countries by the beginning of 1980's.

Touching upon the USSR's trade and economic cooperation with developing countries, Iliodor Kulev cites such figures. "In 1976-1980 the Soviet Union's trade with young states increased 110 per cent as compared with 1971-1975, and on the whole in the previous decade (1971-1980) it increased 280 per cent, with exports -- 240 per cent, while imports -- 340 per cent. The number of the USSR's trade partners in the developing world reached 97 in 1980."

"The training of national cadres holds an important place in the USSR's economic and technical assistance to developing countries", the article runs. "Broadly used is the method of their mass education in the course of construction of industrial and other projects, and also training of vocational centres and higher educational establishments both in the newly-free countries themselves and in the Soviet Union.

The USSR helped train about 1,250,000 specialists in various fields, build 227 training centres, 49 institutes and technicums".

SOVIET REACTION TO STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Moscow Report

LD260818 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 26 Jan 83

[Text] President Reagan has stated that the United States is living through a difficult period. He read out the State of the Union message in Congress. The President pointed out that far too many workers, farmers, young people and especially those belonging to ethnic minorities are experiencing hard times. He also described as threatening the growing budget deficits, but to reduce them, he suggested mainly limiting social programs.

A public opinion poll taken on the day when the President addressed Congress showed the further fall of his popularity. According to the newspaper WASHINGTON POST and the ABC television corporation, 54 percent of the Americans disapprove of what Reagan is doing.

TASS Comment

LD261052 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 26 Jan 83

[Text] Washington January 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports: President Reagan has made the annual State of the Union address to a joint session of both chambers of the U.S. Congress. His speech showed that his administration has not drawn any lessons from the bitter experience of the past two years and is bent on stubbornly pursuing the bankrupt course for an all-round buildup of military spending and simultaneous reductions in social programs, thus eroding the well-being of millions of Americans.

The President had to devote his speech in the first place to the probems of the economy, which, he conceded himself, "is troubled". "For too many of our fellow citizens -- farmers, steel and auto workers, lumbermen, black teenagers, and working mothers -- this is a painful period", he lamented describing the plight of the victims of the current economic crisis as an "ordeal". Unemployment, the U.S. President said, is far too high, the industrial recession was deeper than the government had expected, and federal budget deficits are a "clear and present danger" to the country's economic health. The United States, he said, needs "to restart our stalled economic engines".

He then limited himself to enumerating such acute internal probems as the crisis in the sphere of education, sexual discrimination, the runaway crime rate, the arduous position of the farmers and the outsize costs of medical care. The problems facing the United States were enormous and formidable, President Reagan pointed out warning that "we have a long way to go" to overcome them.

As it should have been expected, Reagan attempted again to blame the truly catastrophic position, where his administration has landed the country, on his predecessors. But, as political observers note, facts invalidate this claim. For example, when Reagan entered office, the jobless in the United States accounted for 7.4 per cent of the workforce, while today, even according to clearly understated government data, 10.8 per cent of the workforce, or 12 million Americans are deprived as a result of the administration's policy of opportunities to have a job and the unemployment rate has reached the highest point for the past 41 years.

The deficit of the federal budget which, in Reagan's words, concerns him so, and which during the race for President he promised to eliminate, is to top 200 billion dollars in the current fiscal year, according to government officials. After the two years of the present administration's stay in power the country found itself in a deep crisis resembling in scale the 'Great Depression' of the 1930's.

Last year manufacturing enterprises in the United States worked at only 67.3 per cent of their capacity, the gross national product dropped 1.8 percent, the volume of housing construction decreased and many other major economic indices deteriorated. The number of people living below the official poverty line reached 32 million during the administration's stay in power. All this is a consequence of the anti-people policy of the administration which, and this follow from the presidential message, it is going to pursue in the future as well. The main step Reagan proposes to solve economic problems is a freeze on federal spending. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, this is a formula for a substantial increase in military spending accompanied by cuts in social programs. The budget of the U.S. Defense Department is to grow nine percent, with due account for inflation, in the next fiscal year, while social programs will see a three percent cut.

In the foreign policy part of the message R. Reagan stressed that the U.S. strategy should rest on strength -- economic strength and military power. In conjunction with that he praised sky-high the unprecedented program for America's "re-armament" which will cost the Americans a staggering 1.6 trillion dollars in the coming five years. The President noted that "most of the major systems needed for modernising our defenses are already underway" and that the administration is to discuss one such key system -- the MX missile -- during consultations with the Congress in a few months.

Touching upon Soviet-U.S. relations which he described as a major component part of the U.S. foreign policy, R. Reagan alleged that the United States was ready to work for "a positive change" in them. However, the specific plans of the administration set forth by the President give no ground for speaking of any changes for the better in the U.S. policy. He resorted to undisguised attempts to distort the Soviet Union's policy. Without adducing any proof, the White House occupant ascribed to the Soviet Union the striving for "aggression" and resorted to malicious lies concerning the "use" of Soviet chemical weapons clearly with the aim of distracting attention from the United States' own large-scale preparations for a chemical and bacteriological war.

R. Reagan stated the indisputable fact that the ending of a wasteful arms race would accord with the interests of both the Soviet Union and the United States. However, he made no accompanying constructive proposals which would be aimed at solving this vital problem of the present day. Touching upon the talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe, he restricted himself to repeating the pseudo-zero option which deamdns virtually unilateral disarmament from the Soviet Union.

R. Reagan advertised the alleged "peaceful character" of U.S. diplomacy, saying that the United States can take pride in its "peace-making role," specifically, in the Middle East, in Central and South America. But truly, there is no limit to the hypocrisy of those words. The United States' peacemaking role in the Middle East in actual fact means unqualified support for Israeli aggressors and expansionists who, relying on Washington's assistance, terrorise the Arab countries, commit ever new acts of aggression and genocide against the Arab people of Palestine, sabotage efforts for a lasting and just settlement of the Middle East problem and are trying to solidify their occupation of the indigenous Arab lands. As to Central and South America, the real value of "peaceableness" of Washington's diplomacy is known well by the peoples of Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala and other countries where Washington is striving without ceremony to establish the order that would suit U.S. imperialism, where it is trying with the help of wholesale terror and bloody reprisals to suppress the struggle of peoples for national dignity, freedom and independence.

PRAVDA EVALUATES REAGAN'S FIRST 2 YEARS IN OFFICE

PM251001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[S. Vishnevskiy article: "Two Years On"]

[Text] Two years ago the Republican Ronald Reagan took his place in the White House. Half of his 4-year presidential term has now gone by.

In his first speeches after coming to power the 40th U.S. President solemnly proclaimed a "new beginning for America" and promised to lead the country "along a fundamentally new path" toward accelerated economic growth and a "better future for all citizens." He pretentiously called his program a "program of economic rebirth." At the same time the slogan of "increasing American military might," which alone, allegedly, can ensure peace, was put forward.

To paraphrase Voltaire's aphorism, one may say; If the Republican administration's domestic and foreign program had not existed, it would have been necessary to invent it for the edification of our contemporaries. For it is further expressive evidence of the historical bankruptcy of imperialism, its aggressiveness, its antipopular, antihumanist nature and the futility of its formulas.

There has been no new beginning for America, nor could there be, since the administration that came to power in January 1981 is probably the most conservative American Administration of the 20th century after that of Herbert Hoover, under which the world crisis of 1929 broke out.

It expresses the interests of the most reactionary, aggressive circles of monopoly capital and the ruling clique of the military industrial complex. The right wing of the Republican Party, which brought Reagan into the political arena, has always been notable for its longing for the "good old days," when all life in the United States was under the iron heel of capital and American imperialism held sway with impunity in the international arena. This nostalgia permeates all the present administration's activity. It is no accident that the President has to give public assurances that he does not head "a negative government which is trying to turn back the clock." That is exactly the way that many observers assess his course.

Big business is represented more extensively than ever before in Washington's corridors of power. The well-known sociologist Ralph Nader calculated in a recent survey that approximately 30 top officials are millionaires, many of them multimillionaires, who "regard the federal government as an instrument for the powerful and rich; this government embodies extremely great wealth and has a narrow view and little sympathy for people." Among the figures in the administration are envoys from monopolies in more than 20 sectors of the economy, often with close links with military business.

Despite the discord and disagreements which can now be observed within the administration, it should be noted that it continues to enjoy very strong support among influential spheres in monopoly capital. This enables it, despite many failures, to hold onto its positions in the country's political life.

The Republican government, on the basis of narrow, selfish class interests, has given up the social maneuvering to which a series of administrations had resorted since the early thirties. Reagan's predecessors promised to create a "state of universal prosperity," promised "class peace," declared "war on poverty," and so forth. In making some forced concessions to the working people, they were using a "safety valve" mechanism designed to "let off the steam" of the dissatisfaction of poor Americans. Now this has been given up.

The present administration's socioeconomic policy is aimed at the all-around satisfaction of the interests of monopoly capital at the working people's expense. It has managed to push through Congress a series of bills granting corporations large tax concessions. Changes in the system of state control of the economy are aimed at redistributing the country's national income in favor of big business. The most generous gifts are given to the military-industrial monopolies in the form of the sharply increased Pentagon orders for weapons. "If you work in the defense industry, this administration is good for business," Leon Weiner, president of a corporation of the same name, notes.

Good for the weapons buisness, but what about for the working people's masses? Under the slogan "guns, not butter," the government has launched a frontal attack on the people's essential rights. Draconian reductions in social appropriations in 1982 alone struck a painful blow against the interests of approximately 20 million people. This year the White House intends to cut such expenditure by approximately $30 billion more. Whole categories of the population have fallen under the budget axe -- the poor, old age pensioners, the impoverished sick, young people who need vocational training and so forth.

The most tragic phenomenon of the last 2 years was the increase in the army of unemployed by more than 4 million, to 12 million. More than 3 million of these have no roof over their heads. The White House is not even promising to eliminate unemployment now, it only speaks vaguely of some reduction in it over 3-4 years.

Despite attempts to resolve economic disorders at the working people's expense, no "revival" in the economy is taking place. "For too many of us economic improvement is still some faceless stranger in the remote, icy future," Reagan recently advised. The crisis which began in 1979 continues to rage. In the last 2 years industrial production has fallen by more than 8 percent and tens of thousands of enterprises have gone bankrupt. Extensive industrial regions of the country are in the grip of a deep recession. The budget deficit, which is already over $100 billion, promises to rise to $150-200 billion.

"Reaganomics" is not working -- that is the almost unanimous assessment of economists across the ocean. Reagan himself is now refraining from making optimistic predictions in public.

Most statesmen and observers in different countries, in assessing the Reagan administration's 2 year of foreign policy activity, agree that Washington's course is formulated and pursued in isolation from reality.

Nobody is surprised that a right wing conservative government feels class hostility toward progress and socialism. But this is blind hatred -- a poor political adviser. On the Potomac it prevails over commonsense. The anti-Soviet cliches in which certain people in Washington think, the historian George Kennan notes, "are so far from a sober analysis of objective reality that they are not only ineffective, but dangerous in conducting affairs." This approach has already led repeatedly to rash decisions from which even the closest U.S. allies have dissociated themselves. A "crusade" was proclaimed against the socialist countries, which was far from causing rapture among the Western partners. Economic sanctions were announced, and later had to be lifted, since they were mainly harming West Europeans, as well as American business circles. The first American President, George Washington, rightly said: "The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred is a slave to its own animosity."

If the bellicose talk on the Potomac about the striving for U.S. military superiority and about "victorious limited or protracted" nuclear wars has convinced the world public of anything, it is that the U.S. leaders already have more than enough imperial ambitions and militarist impulses. And this is arousing justified wariness everywhere.

U.S. practical actions in the international arena have shown clearly where the threat to peace originates. Many members of the administration have repeatedly admitted that buildup, on an unprecedented scale, of new types and systems of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction is geared toward achieving U.S. military superiority. Such aspirations are futile. But they do increase the threat of a new war.

The stepping up of the arms race to a qualitatively new and much more dangerous stage by the United States and its NATO partners and the imperialists policy of force, pressure and blackmail have exacerbated the situation in the world to an extremely dangerous degree. Such is the main outcome of Washington's foreign policy in the last 2 years which will do nothing to embellish American history.

During that period, the United States' unenviable reputation as an international gendarme has become even stronger. Complicity in the Israeli military's monstrous brigandage in Lebanon, continuous threats and provocation against Cuba and Nicaragua, support for military dictatorships in Latin America and Asia, rapprochement with the South African racists, the increase in the number of U.S. servicemen overseas by nearly 30,000 men in 1982 alone and the creation of new regional military commands within the Armed Forces system -- all of this demonstrates the United States' hegemonist aspirations. However, the attempts to use strong-arm methods in various world troublespots are being increasingly rebuffed by the peoples who treasure their independence. In the world community including at UN forums, the United States is increasingly frequently finding itself in a ring of isolation.

The methods of diktat are alienating its military bloc allies and partners. The past months have been marked by a further worsening of conflicts between the United States and other NATO members on a broad range of economic and political problems.

U.S. prestige continues to tumble. This gave former President J. Carter grounds for remarking that "there is not one country whose relations with the United States have improved since Reagan's arrival in the White House. The exceptions are just two or three countries ruled by right wing dictatorships."

Which way are the Washington strategists leading America, which way are they pushing the world? -- These questions are now being asked by millions of people as they observe the dangerous direction of U.S. policy. It is paradoxical but a fact that the current U.S. Administration's bellicose statements and militarist activeness have considerably helped the broad public circles on both sides of the Atlantic to acquire insight and to realize the need to suppress the growing danger of war. "In the opinion of many Americans and Europeans, under Reagan the threat of our becoming involved in nuclear war is far greater than under any of his predecessors," THE WASHINGTON POST states. A powerful antiwar movement has gripped Europe and many Asian and American countries and has become a hallmark of the early eighties. McCarthy-like attacks by the U.S. authorities against peace supporters have merely increased the conviction that Washington is ruled by "superhawks."

Over 10 million Americans voted at referendums last November for a reciprocal freeze on the USSR and U.S. nuclear arsenals. More opponents of militarization have been elected to the current Congress than to the previous one.

Pressure from the peace-loving forces has compelled U.S. diplomats to sit down to nuclear arms limitation and reduction talks. People of good will are persistently demanding that the United States subject to a businesslike examination the USSR's constructive new initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race and give a positive reply to the Warsaw Pact states' peace proposals. All states, if they value the fate of their peoples, must have an objective interest in preventing the slide toward war. The attainment of just and mutually acceptable agreements on the cardinal questions of war and peace based on the principle of equality and identical security would also meet the vitally important interests of the U.S. people.

SOVIET SCHOLAR EXAMINES REAGAN ECONOMIC PROGRAM

LD260958 Moscow TASS in English 0803 GMT 26 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 26 TASS -- "The results of the two-year-old effort to implement Reagan's economic programme leave no doubt that it has been an utter failure," points out Soviet scholar Georgiy Skorov in an interview published in the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA today.

President Reagan, the article says, promised prosperity, but, in fact, the USA is being currently swept with a crisis, which has gone completely out of control. The President promised to accelerate economic growth and create new jobs, but, in actual fact, during the years of his presidency unemployment grew by four million and is now over 12 million, and considering the number of partially employed people, it has reached 20 million (17 per cent of the total labour force). The load on production facilities in the USA has now dropped down to the lowest post-war level -- 68 per cent, while in the steel industry it is even less than 30 per cent.

The President promised to balance the country's budget, but has actually led his country, judging by the estimates for the current year, to a 200 billion dollar deficit, the highest-ever in the USA. But when deficit grows, simultaneously the country's national debt grows too, it is now more than 1.2 trillion dollars.

It is noteworthy that the Reagan administration boasts of a 2.5-fold decrease in the rate of inflation, the Soviet economist goes on to note. But credit for it by no means goes to the administration, but to the economic crisis. Mr. Crisis has "worked well": The gates of many mills and factories have closed, there is a slump in trade, millions of people have been sacked, the real pay to workers has been reduced, grants and benefits to the poor people have been axed. This is the real cause of a drop in the inflation rate.

The President, Georgiy Skorov goes on to note, promised the Americans a rise in the living standards, but has, in actual fact, cut spendings on social programmes by 90 billion dollars, to say nothing of a drop in the living standards in connection with the loss of jobs and the general deterioration of the economic situation.

The President promised to relieve the people from the burden of government and revive America's morale. But from whatever angle you look at it, the Soviet scholar stresses, there has been no real easing of the government burden. As far as morale is concerned, it has long not been that low in many Americans.

U.S. OPPOSITION TO 'REAGANOMICS' NOTED

LD251230 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] New York January 25 TASS -- The "great depression of the 1980s" is an expression which has struck firm roots in the vocabulary of the Americans who are now experiencing the deepest and most protracted economic recession in the entire post-war history of the country. The UPI news agency emphasises that the problem of the serious ailment of the economy is now more acute than it was two years ago before the inauguration of President Reagan. Last year the gross national product declined for the first time since 1946 by 1.8 per cent. Industrial production went down by over eight per cent. All leading branches of industry are in a critical condition. Steel and truck production is now only 50 per cent of the figure for 1967. The steadily mounting unemployment has already embraced 12 million people.

The main cause of this disastrous situation, local observers point out, is the short-sighted and dangerous economic policy of the Reagan administration. The NEWSDAY says that it is precisely Reaganomics which is the main obstacle to an economic recovery of the United States. The article points out that the responsibility for the present chaos in the economy of the country largely rests with Ronald Reagan who obstinately refuses to abandon the plans for unprecendented military build-up.

Gus Hall, the secretary-general of the United States Communist Party, penetratingly analyzed the economic situation in the United States. In an article contributed to the DAILY WORLD he emphasized that poverty and hunger in the country are growing in direct proportion to the increase in unemployment, the number of dismissals and cuts in vital social programmes. The most significant feature of the present situation, the leader of the United States Communist Party points out, is that it experiences an unusual cyclical crisis. The economic system in the power of the monopolies got entangled into a net made up of many crises each of which is inseparably linked with the overall crisis of capitalism.

A sharp rise in distrust for the policy of the Reagan administration can be noted in the country. A public opinion poll, held jointly by the ABC television company and THE WASHINGTON POST, revealed that over half the Americans emphatically disapprove of the policy of the present head of the White House. A similar investigation, arranged by the CBS television company and THE NEW YORK TIMES showed that 56 percent of the citizens of the country regard the President's approach to economic problems as absolutely wrong. At the same time 66 percent of the polled condemn the White House attitude to the problem of unemployment.

OPINION POLL CITED ON REAGAN POPULARITY RATING

LD251330 Moscow TASS in English 1149 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Washington January 25 TASS -- THE WASHINGTON POST says that when President Reagan today delivers the traditional "State of the Union" message he will address a nation that is highly skeptical over the way the head of the administration manages the affairs of the country. THE WASHINGTON POST based its opinion on the results of a public opinion poll held jointly with ABC television company.

The poll has shown, the newspaper notes, that President Reagan's popularity is now lower than at any time of his stay in the White House. The newspaper says that for the first time the majority of the Americans expressed weak confidence and the lack of any confidence in that his programme would lead to an improvement in the economy. The majority even declared that Reagan had gone too far in increasing military expenditures and cutting social programmes.

Indeed, as the results of the poll have shown, 54 percent of the Americans do not approve the activity of the head of the administration and only 42 percent comment favourably on it. Yet, as late as October 1982, 49 percent supported the President and 44 percent opposed him. THE WASHINGTON POST adds that Reagan has lost supporters in all political sections of the population, both Democrats and Republicans.

According to the poll, only four out of every ten Americans expressed confidence that the administration's policy would lead to improvement in the economic position of the country. THE WASHINGTON POST says that for the first time since the inauguration of the President a majority of those polled, 54 percent, declared that he had gone too far in increasing military appropriations.

Significant in this respect is that 51 per cent of those polled strongly opposed the plans for the manufacture and deployment of the latest MX intercontinental first-strike ballistic missiles. Only 38 per cent of those polled supported this militaristic programme.

The real attitude of the rank and file Americans to the policy of the administration is revealed by statements quoted by the newspaper. A 24-year-old Californian said that Reagan did not show any solicitude for the American people. We did not know what he was doing. He had cut appropriations for education and was taking away money from those who really needed it. His policy was terrible. A 58-year-old woman living in Little Rock (Arkansas) said that she believed that the President absolutely ignored the interests not only of poor Americans but even of the middle class Americans.

STATE DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN'S REMARKS CRITICIZED

LD260030 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] A high-ranking State Department official of the United States has held a news conference in Washington, where they [as heard] accused the Soviet Union of an attempt to intimidate America's close allies -- Federal Germany and Japan. Viktor Olin has this comment.

What the official, who preferred not to identify himself, actually had in mind was the Soviet Union's position concerning the deployment of new American missiles in Federal Germany and the program of militarization being carried out by Japan. The State Department official interpreted the Soviet Union's reasonable warning about the dangerous consequences that these two moves may have as a threat. But, as often happens in similar cases, he lacked any proper argumentation in facts to prove his point. Here are some examples of the rhetorics he was engaged in:

He declared, according to the UPI news agency, that Moscow's efforts to secure an agreement on limiting intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe may be appropriately characterized as an effort to disrupt the determination to deploy, as distinct from the effort to advance the negotiations in Geneva. The official also said serious negotiations with Moscow will continue, but that the administration will work with its allies to uphold the 1979 decision to deploy the Pershing II and cruise missiles in the event an agreement is not reached with Moscow this year. In other words, if the Soviet Union fails to yield to the demand to disarm unilaterally.

The position taken by the Soviet Union is qualified as threatening. But the intention to deploy new American missiles, and thus saturate Europe with more nuclear arms, spur up the arms race and intensify the danger of a conflict -- all this is bound, according to the logic of Washington officials, to contribute to peace and security.

Washington extends a similar logic to the program of militarization being carried out by the Japanese Government. Japan's refusal to develop good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union, the deployment of up-to-date American planes capable of carrying nuclear arms in the immediate vicinity to the Soviet Union's territory, plans to lay mines in international waters and, finally, the intention to make Japan an unsinkable aircraft carrier of the United States -- all this should be qualified, as it turns out, as peaceable gestures, whereas the Soviet Union's warning about the dangerous nature of these plans is a threat.

The news conference of the high-ranking State Department official has, obviously, been one of the first elements of the propaganda campaign officially sanctioned by Washington recently. One of the purposes of the campaign is to draw the attention of the world public away from Soviet peace initiatives aimed at reducing and scrapping nuclear arms in Europe and the world over.

Another goal of the campaign is to camouflage America's stake on the threat of a nuclear war as an instrument for handling world affairs. The news conference in Washington has also revealed that misinformation and abuse of logic remain chief propaganda methods resorted to by the American Administration.

SOROKIN ARTICLE EXAMINES U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

PM241331 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jan 83 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Admiral A. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate: "Washington's Global Pretensions: The U.S. Desire for World Hegemony Is a Threat to All Peoples"]

[Text] Soviet people are resolving the impressive tasks of communist building in an inspired manner. They are working with great enthusiasm to fulfill the plan of the country's economic and social development for the 3d year of the 5-year plan approved by the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum and confirmed by the 7th USSR Supreme Soviet session. Our great motherland is becoming mightier every day.

Communist building in our country is inseparably linked with the struggle to preserve and strengthen peace and to ensure the people's security. The Soviet Union cannot disregard the fact that the international situation has recently been exacerbated to extremely dangerous limits. A real and ever-growing threat has arisen to mankind's very existence.

The exacerbation of the situation in the world arena has been caused by the activation of the most bellicose groupings in the West -- groupings whose class hatred of socialism gains the upper hand over a sense of reality and sometimes even over commonsense. The reactionary circles of imperialism, above all U.S. imperialism, are trying to retard, halt and, if successful, reverse the process of historical development.

Imperialist reaction is seeking to preserve and even widen the sphere of its supremacy with a view to the unlimited exploitation of the people's masses for the sake of enriching the capitalist monopolies to the maximum by seizing key positions on both a regional and global scale and ensuring a correlation of forces advantageous to itself. "Adventurism and readiness to gamble with mankind's vital interests in the name of their own narrow mercenary aims," the 26th CPSU Congress documents pointed out, "is what is manifested particularly blatantly in the policy of imperialism's most aggressive circles.... They have really set themselves the aim of achieving the unachievable -- erecting a barrier in the path of progressive changes in the world and regaining the role of rulers of the peoples' destinies."

Hegemonist impulses and the desire for supremacy in the world arena have always been inherent in imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism. V.I. Lenin pointed that out. "World supremacy," he warned, is, to put it briefly, "the substance of imperialist policy."

It is true that in the seventies the American leaders deemed it advisable to approach world problems with greater circumspection and to agree to the policy of detente. However, the Reagan administration has considered all that superfluous. It shamelessly declared its imperial ambitions. The Republican Party openly proclaimed in its election program: "There is no region of the world to which America's interest do not extend, and the United States must possess sufficient strength to cope with the use of forces on any scale throughout the world." Aggressiveness and adventurism and pretensions to "American leadership" have now been elevated in the United States to the rank of state policy.

For the sake of achieving their aims the American ruling circles have, in point of fact, taken the path of abandoning observance of the principles of international relations enshrined in the Final Act of the Helsinki all-European conference, which was also signed by the U.S. President, and deviating from agreements and accords reached with the Soviet Union in previous years. Seeking to realize its hegemonist designs, Washington is permitting itself to interfere shamelessly in the internal affairs of sovereign states whose system and usages are not to its liking, and it dictates "rules of behavior" to its own allies and partners, totally disregarding their interests. As emphasized in the Warsaw Pact states' Political Declaration adopted at the Prague conference of the Political Consultative Committee, "imperialist circles are pursuing a policy of forces, pressure, diktat, interference in internal affairs and infringement of states' national independence and sovereignty and are seeking to consolidate and recast 'spheres of influence.'"

The views of the most bellicose circles of U.S. monopoly capital are embodied in Washington's present foreign policy course. The U.S. Administration's entire activity is thoroughly permeated with anticommunism and anti-Sovietism. It has countered the policy of detente with a policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union and other socialist community states. It has wrecked the ratification of the SALT II treaty, as well as the treaties on limiting underground nuclear weapon tests and underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Attempts are continuing to be made to interfere crudely in Poland's affairs and to push counterrevolutionary elements in that country into taking overt action.

The Camp David compact, the direct inciting of Israel to commit aggression against Arab peoples, the broad support for Britain's colonialist aspirations during the armed conflict in the South Atlantic, the nurturing of antipopular dictatorial regimes in Central American countries and in other parts of the world, the organization of coups d'etat advantageous to the United States, the waging of the undeclared war against Afghanistan -- all this is handiwork of American imperialism. The creation of the "Central Command" (Centcom), whose zone of operation covers an extensive part of the globe located many thousands of kilometers from American shores, was a graphic manifestation of U.S. globalist aspirations.

At the same time, people on the other side of the ocean are intensively seeking new means to preserve the U.S. role as leader of the "free world" and to consolidate the right to shape the West's unified policy in the world arena on the basis of recognition of Washington's aims as the common aims of all capitalist countries. Without beating about the bush, U.S. Vice President Bush declared to his European allies: "Well, excuse me, the United States is the leader of the free world, and under the present administration we are once again starting to act accordingly."

How far Washington's desire to bend to its diktat the developed capitalist states which are its partners in the North Atlantic bloc has gone is evidenced by the arm-twisting policy being pursued in NATO and other international imperialist associations. The American ruling circles' mercenary intentions were manifested particularly graphically in the notorious sanctions against West European firms fulfilling orders for the "Siberia-West Europe" gas pipeline. It was no coincidence that French External Relations Minister Cheysson evaluated the U.S. actions as "an attempt to extend its administration's power outside its own geographic borders." Japan, too, is being pressured from across the ocean. To please Washington and to the detriment of its own national interests, as is known, it frequently "corrects" its political and economic relations with the Soviet Union. Real socialism is the chief obstacle to the hegemonist U.S. aspirations. Washington has always seen and continues to see socialism's strengthening economic, political and defense positions as the main obstacle to the realization of their imperial ambitions. Unwilling to accept a reduction of imperialism's opportunities to hold sway over other countries and peoples, the most bellicose representatives of the U.S. ruling elite are looking for new ways of restoring their dominance in international relations. Their declared aim is to weaken socialism and gain themselves a "free hand."

U.S. ruling circles are making a special report to provide this imperialist course with "ideological backup." The instruments of diplomacy and propaganda and the methods of "psychological warfare" are being used for this purpose. This is also the purpose of the "crusade" against communism announced by Reagan last year.

Its initiators are unwilling to face up to the real facts, to the changes in the world as a result of which Marxism-Leninism has become the world outlook of hundreds of millions of people prepared to defend it against all attacks. Attempts are made to "morally discredit" the socialist countries and impudent, and groundless charges are made concerning violations of human rights in these countries. They try to shift onto the Soviet Union and other socialist states the responsibility for "international terrorism." There is a constant ballyhoo over the imaginary "Soviet military threat." In short, Washington is quite prepared to directly slander socialism and to attempt blackmail and overt provocations.

Proceeding on the basis of the correlation of forces in the international arena and taking into sober consideration the effect of the laws of social development and the lessons of history, we are convinced of the absolute futility of U.S. attempts to weaken socialism and of its bid for supremacy. But, at the same time, one cannot ignore the fact that in their striving for hegemony the U.S. ruling circles are utilizing a vast economic, scientific, technical and military potential and are pursuing an exclusively adventurist course in international affairs, and their main gamble is on the "position of strength" policy, on the use of methods of armed coercion.

The United States is carrying out its attempts to achieve its aims by methods of armed coercion in various forms and in various directions. They include threatening to use weapons, conducting an unbridled arms race and imposing it on others, widening its military presence in particular parts of the world and staging shows of force, using weapons in local conflicts and waging limited aggressive wars. Nor do the imperialist hawks rule out the extreme form of armed coercion -- world nuclear missile war. Not only do they not rule it out, they are carrying out intensive and systematic preparations for it.

Regarding the use of armed force to implement its hegemonist designs as perfectly acceptable and even essential, the Reagan administration has steered, ever since it entered the White House a course towards increasing militarist preparations and striving for military superiority. And Washington's paramount intention is to smash the existing approximate equality between the Soviet Union and the United States in the strategic arms sphere.

Back in October 1982 President Reagan announced a "comprehensive program" for the nuclear rearming of America. It includes the creation of sophisticated means of strategic attack -- MX ICBM's, a fleet of nuclear submarines carrying Trident ballistic missiles, the B-1B and Stealth strategic bombers and long-range cruise missiles with various basing modes -- and also the modernization of the communications system and strategic offensive forces control. The implementations of the entire program is planned to last through the nineties. But its implementation has already begun and is taking place at an accelerated rate.

At the same time the United States has refused point blank to follow the example of the Soviet Union, which has made the historic pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Administration representatives have tried to declare "unacceptable" the USSR's far-reaching proposals in the sphere of strategic arms limitation and reduction put forward by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the report "60 Years of the USSR" -- proposals which were assessed highly not only by progressive forces, but by sober-minded politicians in many Western countries.

U.S. plans to wreck the approximate equality in medium-range nuclear arms which exists in Europe constitute a serious threat to the cause of peace. Under the NATO decision imposed by Washington, it is planned to deploy nearly 600 American Pershing II missiles and cruise missiles with nuclear warheads on the territory of a number of West European countries. The implementation of this plan would lead to a substantial buildup in the U.S. strategic potential targeted on the Soviet Union and would turn the peoples of Western Europe into Washington's hostages.

The United States is increasingly persistently using the North Atlantic bloc for its own imperial purposes. This was confirmed by the winter session of the bloc's leading organs. It was decided to step up large-scale military preparations by the member-countries. At the same time the NATO Council adopted a decision on stepping up activities outside the bloc's sphere. The United States intends to use this decision to consolidate its positions in various parts of the world, suppress the people's liberation movements and extend the chain of military bases.

Here a special role is assigned to the Rapid Deployment Force. As U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger stated in an interview for the Egyptian newspaper AL-AKHBAR, "the main task of the American Rapid Deployment Force is to protect the oilfields and defend American interests and the interests of America's friends in any part of the world." That is what he said: "in any part of the world".

The same goal is served by the 1,500 U.S. military bases and other military sites located on the territory of 82 foreign states. More than half a million American servicemen are permanently stationed at these bases. Alongside the military blocs created by Washington -- NATO, ANZUS, ANZUK and others -- these bases are regarded as a springboard for aggression in the "one and one-half," "two and one-half" or even "five" wars planned by the Pentagon.

Washington is increasingly actively drawing Japan, which is linked with the United States by the so-called "security treaty," into its plans and preparations, which are dangerous to the cause of peace. The United States seeks to turn Japan into a gendarme in East Asia and the Pacific and to use Japanese territory for its own aggressive designs.

All this is designed for the creation of a material base for the struggle against socialism and the peoples' liberation movement and for the implementation of hegemonist designs. The same aims are served by the military doctrines and strategic concepts elaborated by Washington. Official representatives of the American Administration keep uttering arguments about the possibility of "limited," "protracted" and other varieties of nuclear war. They are trying to accustom people to the idea not only of its acceptability, but even of the possibility of a U.S. victory in such a war.

The strategy of "direct confrontation" to which Washington adheres is openly aggressive in nature. It provides for the resolute U.S. use of military might as a means of implementing world diktat and defending American imperialism's "vital interests" in various parts of the world, including access to sources of strategic raw materials and energy resources. And the main gamble is on preparations for strategic nuclear war and various options for the use of strategic forces in such a war -- from the so-called "limited" nuclear strikes to the massive use of nuclear strikes. In all these plans the main attention is devoted to inflicting the first strike.

At the same time the strategy of "direct confrontation" is aimed at preparing the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies for waging a war using conventional means of destruction alone and for extending combat operations to any region of the globe where the enemy is "most vulnerable."

The unrestrained arms race, the pursuit of military superiority and the unconcealed desire for world domination are a threat to all the planet's peoples. People in all countries of the globe are aware even today of the colossal damage which American imperialism's policy is doing to them. This policy leads to the further exacerbation of such problems as hunger and disease, lack of culture and illiteracy, from which hundreds of millions of people on all continents suffer. Today 40 percent of the globe's population receive no effective medical services and 570 million people do not have enough to eat. The army of unemployed is growing from month to month in capitalist countries. In the developed capitalist countries alone it totals 35-40 million people.

Washington's gamble on a "position of strength" policy and the U.S. ruling circles' imperial pretensions and attempts to realize them by means of armed coercion give further impetus to the galvanization of reaction in all directions which V.I. Lenin viewed as one of the most important signs of imperialism.

The U.S. striving for world supremacy and its hegemonist aspirations threaten many countries and peoples with the loss of national independence and statehood and threaten freedomfighters with coercion from repressive antipopular regimes. In the United States itself, one can observe an overt attack on working people's rights. Spending on social needs is falling sharply while the military budget grows unabated (in the current fiscal year it will exceed $250 billion and for next year the administration is demanding nearly $300 billion in appropriations for military purposes). An unconcealed offensive is being waged against civil rights. Strikes are being violently suppressed, the surveillance and persecution of dissidents are being intensified and racial discrimination is flourishing.

The U.S. aggressive policy and pursuit of world supremacy threaten mankind's most sacred and main right -- the right to life. The militarist preparations carried out by the United States and its NATO allies and the preparation of alternative forms of nuclear war should be viewed as a direct attack on that right.

The peoples are now moving to the forefront of history more than ever. They have acquired the right to a voice which no one can stifle. That voice is becoming louder and louder. It is being raised by the millions of the masses of fighters for peace and participants in antiwar movements in many countries of the world. Their activeness has already thwarted some very dangerous plans by imperialist reaction. That activeness is continuing to grow and is becoming an increasingly serious obstacle in the path of the imperialist instigators of war.

The community of socialist states is playing a tremendous and beneficial role in the modern world. That community is a powerful and healthy body. Its strength and prestige were convincingly reaffirmed at the conference of the Warsaw Pact states Political Consultative Committee in Prague in whose work the supreme representatives of the allied socialist states took part. Great interest was aroused throughout the world by the major new proposal put forward at the Political Consultative Committee session -- to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the members of the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty.

The results of the Political Consultative Committee conference show that the Warsaw Pact states are making every effort to reliably defend socialist gains and values against imperialism's onslaughts, are struggling jointly to strengthen peace and the relaxation of tension and are improving their political cooperation. By its realistic nature, the Political Declaration adopted in Prague has perturbed Western militarist circles. Washington can no longer simply brush aside the provisions contained in it.

The participants in the Political Consultative Committee conference expressed full approval and support for the Soviet Union's peace initiative. The USSR has recently put forward a number of very important proposals aimed at limiting and reducing strategic arms and limiting nuclear arms in Europe. These proposals were set out in concentrated form in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's report at the joint ceremonial session held in the Kremlin to mark the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation. Our position is clear, he said. Nuclear war, be it great or small, total or limited, must be prevented.

In putting forward its proposals the Soviet Union still considers it necessary to restate to the whole world that it will never permit its own or its allies' security to be threatened. Imperialism's aggressive intrigues compel the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries to take great pains to maintain their defense potential and the combat might and combat readiness of their armed forces.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government have already warned more than once that we will never permit anyone to upset the military-strategic equilibrim that exists in the world. That warning is based on developed socialism's real potential. The USSR will be forced to answer the U.S. challenge by deploying corresponding weapons systems: for MX missiles, our own analogous missiles; and for U.S. long-range cruise missiles, our own long-range cruise missiles which are already being tested.

The latter-day pretenders to world supremacy should remember the great advantages of our system -- a system which expressed the basic interests and requirements of the working masses and defends their rights, freedom and life itself. Its strength lies in the firm ideological-political, social and international unity of Soviet society, in the monolithic cohesion of communists and all Soviet people around the Leninist Central Committee and in the indestructible unity of the party and the people. "That people will never be defeated," V.I. Lenin stressed, "in whom the majority of workers and peasants realize, sense and see that they are...defending a cause whose victory will provide them and their children with the opportunity to enjoy all the boons of culture and all the creations of human labor." Those who have ignored this truth and paid no heed to our social and spiritual advantages have suffered severe retribution.

The Soviet Union, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the results of the Political Consultative Committee's Prague conference stresses, is doing its utmost for the triumph of reason in international affairs. It will continue to consistently pursue a Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence with states with a different social system while maintaining vigilance against the intrigues of the enemies of socialism and peace and taking the requisite measures to ensure the country's security.

'PEACE SUPPORTERS' DEMONSTRATE IN CALIFORNIA

LD242358 Moscow TASS in English 2240 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Text] San Francisco January 25 TASS -- More than 700 people who took part in a peace march co-organised by several organisations of peace supporters of California came to Wandenberg Air Force Base (California). They were carrying streamers saying "No to Nuclear Weapons", "We Demand an End to the Insane Arms Race", "Stop the Testing of MX Missiles".

Addressing a rally held in front of the base the speakers called for stepping up the struggle against the plans for the deployment of MX nuclear missiles in the United States.

The authorities brought in the police to disperse the demonstration. More than one hundred people were arrested, among them a 79-year-old woman who marked her birthday by taking part in the peace march, and a 12-year old boy.

According to reports, the Pentagon had to cancel the MX test firings planned for this week.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS PLIGHT OF U.S. VIETNAM VETERANS

LD172342 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 17 Jan 83

["IZVESTIYA: Victims of One's Weapons" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS -- The newspaper IZVESTIYA carries an article by its Washington correspondent A. Palladin in which he describes the tragedy of American servicemen subjected in Vietnam to defoliants and herbicides used by the Pentagon against that Asian country.

Recalling that between 1961 and 1971, more than twenty million gallons of American poisons were poured into Vietnam, affecting millions of Indochinese inhabitants, the newspaper writes: "2.5 million American soldiers served in the Indochinese hell. 95,000 of them, those who survived, have symptoms of defoliant exposure. Similarly with the Vietnamese and Laotians subjected to defoliants, their skin is heavily affected, their limbs are numb, they suffer from paralysis and malignant tumors, and finally, they have genetic changes which cause sterility or birth of physically and mentally handicapped children.

The U.S. Government, however, refuses even to admit the presence of the diseases induced by the combat use of defoliants. The veterans department, charged with the task of examining the complaints of American servicemen subjected to defoliant, confirmed the loss of health among some soldiers who fought in Vietnam, but flatly refused to link this fact with the defoliant use. This means no disability pensions for veterans, no treatment. Well, some are treated: The most stubborn ones are sent to psychiatrists.

There are many reasons explaining such attitude in the United States to its own servicemen. Among them is a mercantile consideration: It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to provide medical assistance for the sufferer. But the main reason, compelling the American authorities to hush up the scandal is to give the green light to the plans of further accumulation of weapons of mass annihilation.

ZORIN DISCUSSES U.S.-PRC TRADE 'DISAGREEMENT'

LD230250 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 19 Jan 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Valentin Zorin]

[Text] The foreign press is carrying many commentaries connected with the failure of American-Chinese talks on the supply of Chinese textiles to the United States. One of the basic types of Chinese exports to the United States, which helps the PRC maintain a balance of sorts, is textiles and items from the sewing industry. This has been the way of things for the last few years.

However, in recent times there has been a revolt by American textile companies, which are finding it difficult to compete with cheap Chinese textiles. If you take into consideration the fact that a substantial proportion of these companies are located in the southern states of the country -- and that the reactionary politicians of the South constitute an important prop for the Reagan government in Washington, then you can find an answer to the question as to why the U.S. Government has decided to demand from Beijing a sharp reduction in the deliveries of Chinese textiles to the American market.

As the paper RENMIN RIBAO writes, in the course of the American-Chinese talks China made a number of very substantial concessions to the United States. However, these concessions not only failed to elicit the desired response, but the United States proposed new, baseless demands to cut back on the import of Chinese textiles. The American side, writes RENMIN RIBAO, is adopting an insincere stance at the talks, and the responsibility for the failure of the talks lies entirely with the United States.

In recent times we have become accustomed to the phrases "cod war", "steel war" and so forth which have entered the international vocabulary. Now the foreign press organs have come to use the phrase "textile war" between the United States and the PRC. However, it is thought that the matter is a lot more than a disagreement between two countries concerning a specific problem. It is, in fact an attempt by the United States to impose unequal economic relations on the PRC, using all possible forms of pressure in the process.

The American press notes with unconcealed chagrin that the disagreement on economic matters between Beijing and Washington occurred 3 weeks before the planned visit to the Chinese captial by George Shultz, the U.S. secretary of state. Commentators are putting forward the idea that this casts a shadow over the prospects of the forthcoming talks, although Shultz will attempt to take the edge off the disagreement. Whether or not this is so, experience shows that Washington will far more readily indulge in gestures and smiles than take into account the real interests of its partners in the talks, especially when it is a matter of the selfish interests of the American monopolies.

DEATH SENTENCE ON MAO'S WIDOW COMMUTED

LD251534 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Beijing January 25 TASS -- XINHUA NEWS AGENCY reports that the criminal chamber of the Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China has commuted today the death sentence of Mao Zedong's widow Jiang Qing and Zhang Chunqiao, former member of the Politbureau of the CPC Central Committee, to life imprisonment.

XINHUA recalls that on January 25, 1981, Jinag Qing and Zhang Chunqiao, the "main criminals" in the case of the "Gang of Four," were sentenced to death with a two year reprieve.

DRA SEEKS BETTER RELATIONS WITH NEIGHBORS

TA251648 Moscow in Dari to Afghanistan 1700 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Recently the Politburo of the PDPA Central Committee met in Kabul and Babrak Karmal delivered a speech. Among other things, he said that the DRA is exerting efforts toward normalization of relations with neighboring countries and that it supports the endeavors of the United Nations in this respect. Reportedly, Diego Cordovez, the UN secretary general's special envoy has concluded his talks in Iran, and is presently in Pakistan and will shortly arrive in Kabul in order to meet and hold talks with the leaders of the DRA.

Babrak Karmal's statement once again proves that the DRA attached and continues to attach immense importance to the cause of normalizing relations with its neighbors. At the same time it is very clear that had there been no interference in the affairs of the DRA, particularly from Pakistani territory, the whole undeclared war waged by the U.S. Government and its allies against Afghanistan would have died out like a fire without wood. At present the danger emanating from the unresolved situation around Afghanistan has increased with respect to the new conspiracies and machinations of U.S. imperialism in the Indian Ocean region and the Persian Gulf.

By establishing the Central Command [words indistinct] the U.S. Government has adopted a policy of drawing the other countries situated in this part of the world into its war preparations and military adventures. The fact that the countries of this part of the world are separated and divided and relations between them have not been normalized provides U.S. imperialism with the means and possibilities to implement its provocative aims and plans.

While exerting efforts to normalize relations with neighbors and to set up relations of mutual interest and friendly cooperation with them, Democratic Afghanistan has repeatedly put forward certain proposals which point the real and specific way toward a political solution of the Afghan situation. The proposals of the DRA Government contained in the statement of 14 May 1980 were precisely of this nature. The essence of these proposals consisted of the cessation of interference in the affairs of the DRA under effective international control and providing the possibility for the (?people's) progress on the path chosen by the Afghan people.

In its proposals of 24 August 1981, the Afghan Government took into consideration the proposals of its future partners who will take part in the talks, and took a step forward toward them. This stance by the Afghan Government provided the possibility for the start of Afghan-Pakistani talks with the (?mediation) of the UN secretary general's special envoy in the fall of last year, and all peace-loving public circles highly assessed this development. As we are aware, the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact countries which held recently expressed its satisfaction about these talks also.

However, while the DRA has exerted and continues to exert every effort for the success of these talks, unfortunately the stance of the countries neighboring Afghanistan is not in the least satisfactory. The reason that the talks in Geneva are going on at a very slow pace is centered in this very fact. At present Diego Cordovez is expressing optimism with respect to the forthcoming talks, and [words indistinct] Iran too will take part in these talks. In this connection one can state that not only the DRA but its aforementioned neighbors also are interested in normalizing the situation of their region.

USSR-POLISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION TALKS END

LD251928 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1800 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Zdzislaw Stankiewicz report from Moscow]

[Text] The deputy premiers of Poland, Zbigniew Madej, and the Soviet Union, Nikolay Talyzin, signed a joint communique this evening summing up the results of the 2-day meeting of the 25th session of the Polish-Soviet intergovernmental commission for economic and scientific-technological cooperation.

During the session, which ended today, matters discussed included mutual-goods deliveries envisaged by the trade protocol for the current year, problems of cooperation and production specialization in various branches of both countries' industry, and expansion of scientific-technological cooperation. In this sphere, it was considered desirable to coordinate more precisely many undertakings in the field of exploiting scientific-technological research and new technologies. There will also be closer cooperation between both countries in the implementation of the following programs: food industry, housing construction, more-effective exploitation of raw material resources, and the development of the power industry.

During the current session of the intergovernmental commission, much time was devoted to matters of bilateral-trade deliveries. Polish-Soviet bilateral trade will reach a value of almost R10 billion this year, of which imports from the Soviet Union accounts for R5.4 billion and exports to the Soviet Union accounts for R4.4 billion. Compared to last year, bilateral trade will grow by 14 percent and the import of Soviet goods will grow 12 percent. In the case of many raw materials -- such as crude oil, gas or cotton -- the Soviet deliveries will be the only source of our foreign purchases.

The trade protocol for the current year and the course of the present session of the commission for cooperation fully confirm the understanding of the Soviet Union for the difficulties experienced by our economy, a fact that is expressed not by mere declarations, but by concrete aid and, as always, partnership cooperation.

Polish Deputy Premier Comments

LD252342 Warsaw PAP in English 2155 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow 25 Jan -- "I would like to stress that since the start of 1982 Poland's needs have met with understanding on the part of the Soviet Union," Poland's Vice-Premier Zbigniew Madej told the PAP correspondent in Moscow after signing the documents adopted by the 25th session of the Polish-Soviet intergovernment commission for economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. "At the beginning of 1982 we received adequate aid in the form of consumer goods. Moreover, we received support in the form of grain loan. We also received extra supplies of 465,000 tonnes of grain, 30,000 tonnes of maize, 23,000 tonnes of rice and other consumer goods upwards of the quantities provided for by the trading protocol. Moreover, the Soviet Union supplied Poland with extra supplies of primary materials. In return for the raw materials, Poland exported part of the finished products to the Soviet Union." Poland fully met her obligations as regards the supply of hard coal to the Soviet Union last year, the vice-premier said.

"Lines of further cooperation were among the main themes tackled at the 25th session of the Polish-Soviet commission. Both sides reviewed the implementation of the protocol on commodity turnovers and payments between Poland and the Soviet Union in 1982, including Soviet assistance in fuller utilization of the production potential of Polish factories," Vice-Premier Madej said.

"Despite many objective hardships facing Polish economy, trade between Poland and the Soviet Union develops successfully. In 1982, the Soviet Union supplied Poland with commodities worth nearly 4,000 million roubles, including primary materials and fuels worth some 3,500 million roubles. Poland in return supplied the Soviet Union with goods worth over 3,100 million roubles, including machines and equipment worth 1,800 million roubles, and fuels and raw materials worth 500 million roubles. The current year is going to see a major rise in Poland's fuels exports to the Soviet Union, notably hard coal. Poland is going to return to the Soviet market with hard coal exports matching the levels recorded before the crisis, namely exceeding 9 million tonnes."

POLISH-SOVIET INDUSTRIAL SYMPOSIUM BEGINS

LD260304 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1600 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] With Deputy Premiers Zbigniew Madej and Nikolay Talyzin taking part, the Polish-Soviet symposium on the possibilities of exporting Polish chemical equipment, machinery and installations began today in Moscow. Representatives of the planning organs, foreign trade representatives and representatives of the economic ministries of the two states were also present. The aim of the symposium is to show Soviet specialists the possibilities open to our enterprises falling under the Ministry of Chemical and Light Industry. The participants in the symposium also visited an exhibition of photograms and models of equipment being offered to the Soviet Union.

HUNGARIAN-SOVIET TRADE PROTOCOL FOR 1983 SIGNED

LD220526 Budapest MTI in English 1026 GMT 22 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, January 20 (MIT) -- A protocol on the exchange of goods signed in Moscow Thursday by Janos Ambrus, deputy minister for foreign trade of Hungary, and his Soviet counterpart, Nikolay Komarov stipulates an over 8,000 million roubles trade in 1983. Present at the signing of the document were Nikolay Talyzin, Soviet deputy prime minister, and his Hungarian counterpart, Jozsef Marjai, co-chairmen of the Hungarian-Soviet intergovernmental economic and technical-scientific cooperation commission.

This year's protocol stipulates specialisation and cooperation as well as the expansion of the export of sophisticated machinery in order to speed up technological development in both countries.

Soviet export to Hungary in 1983 will include metal-processing machinery, equipment for mining, computer technology, road construction, as well as tractors, trucks and motorcars. The Soviet Union will remain Hungary's principal supplier of oil and oil products, gas, electricity, iron ore, and sawn timber. The Soviet Union will continue exporting durable consumer goods.

Hungarian export will include telecommunications goods, computers, installations for the electronics industry, buses, floating cranes and gantry cranes. To facilitate its Food Programme, the Soviet Union will import installations for food industry, poultry and pig farms, agro-machinery and agro-chemicals.

Hungarian companies will participate in the retooling of several Soviet light industrial plants and of a bus factory in Likino.

The participants of the Moscow talks agreed to look for new ways of expanding bilateral trade during the year.

PAPER FEATURES SECTION ON USSR-FRG ECONOMIC TIES

PM251631 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian on 16 January carries on page 3 a feature under the general heading "USSR-FRG: Mutually Beneficial Cooperation" composed of five articles with a 200-word editorial introduction.

The introduction states that economic cooperation between the two states has been "an important component of bilateral relations" for a long time, witness the elevenfold increase in commodity turnover between them from 1970 to 1981, and goes on to itemize the goods in question.

The first article, entitled "Objective Necessity," 900 words in length, is an interview given to the paper by Vladimir Nikolayevich Novikov, USSR trade representative in the FRG, in which he talks about the present state of the two countries' trade and economic cooperation. Novikov outlines bilateral agreements already reached and under discussion. He points out that about 25 percent of commodity turnover in 1981 was on a barter basis, that cooperation also takes place between the FRG and the USSR in third countries and that mixed companies are "operating successfully." He concludes by saying that, despite American pressure on Europe to limit trade with the USSR, USSR-FRG trade rose 14-16 percent in value between 1981 and 1982 over a 10-month period and that "the objective need to develop mutually beneficial trade has shown itself more effective than certain circles' opposition to economic cooperation."

The second article is unattributed, 200 words long and titled "We Look Confidently Into the Future." It reports increasing demand for Soviet machine tools in the FRG and an optimistic speech on prospects for Soviet machine tool sales in the FRG by D. (Gertner), one of the joint owners of a company through which all machine tools are traded.

The third article, entitled "Our Pluses and Minuses" and 700 words long, is by Dr Otto Lambsdorff, FRG economics minister. He considers the USSR trade and industry exhibition in Duesseldorf and the 11th session of the FRG-USSR Commission on Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation to be "highly noteworthy landmarks." He reports the session's finding that cooperative contracts already under way are "on the whole being successfully implemented" and that cooperation since the 10th session has received new development. He states that "both sides see potential for further intensification of trade," mainly in machine building and energy, and that cooperation in the modernization and reconstruction of certain Soviet industrial enterprises, and in joint production and sale of machines and manufacturing equipment remains "promising." The author notes that over 10 months in 1982 compared with the same period in 1981 FRG export trade with the USSR increased by 50 percent and imports by 17 percent, but that on the whole exports to the USSR in recent years have declined, chiefly owing to the worsening world economy, as well as to the two countries' different economic systems and financing problems. He also states that the FRG's excess of imports over exports, accompanied by a rise in the price of energy and raw materials, has worked "one-sidedly" in favor of the USSR trade balance. These factors, in his opinion, are "minuses in our trade," although overall "our economic ties with the Soviet Union have good traditions." Further development of trade, he concludes, will depend to an important extent on political detente.

The fourth article, entitled "In Favor of Free Trade," 550 words in length, is by Otto Wolff Von Amerongen, president of the FRG Union of Chambers of Trade and Industry. The author expresses his pleasure at the present state of FRG-USSR trade and economic relations but regrets the "politicization of the world trading situation." He shows, by statistics, the increase in the overall volume of trade with the CEMA countries, and principally with the USSR. He says that he is not alone in being optimistic for the long-term prospects of FRG-USSR trade but warns against the intrusion of "short-term political factors" into economics.

The fifth article, entitled "To Get To Know Each Other Better," 800 words long, is by correspondent V. Dolgykh, who provides some figures relating to the Duesseldorf trade exhibition and writes about the interest generated among visitors by particular exhibits.

FRG GROUPS OPPOSE U.S. MISSILE DEPLOYMENT PLANS

LD260008 Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 25 TASS -- An open letter of members of the Association of German Trade Unions of the Main-Kinzig district (Hessen) to the delegations at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, released here, says: "It is necessary to renounce the deployment of new American medium range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and to put an end to the production of all types of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons." The trade union functionaries of the district demanded that the nuclear arsenals of France and England be taken into account at the Geneva talks as well as the sea- and air-based nuclear systems of the NATO member countries.

The West German youth organisation "Young Democrats" of North Rhine Westphalia came out against the deployment of new U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in West Germany at their conference in Dusseldorf. Delegates to the conference stressed that the struggle against NATO's "rearmament" remained the major task of the youth organisation.

Delegates to a conference of the German Peace Union Party in Hessen have voiced support for the peace proposals put forward in the Prague declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member countries. They demand in a letter to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl that he support the peace initiatives of the socialist countries. The Prague declaration, the letter says, is a substantial contribution to continued detente, arms restrictions and the safeguarding of world peace.

NINE NEW FRENCH STRATEGIC MISSILES INSTALLED

LD252138 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Paris January 25 TASS -- As the FRANCE PRESSE news agency (AFP) reports, France has installed nine new strategic missiles at Albion Plateau in the country's south-east. Thus, the news agency points out, French land-based strategic nuclear forces now comprise 18 missiles with a range of 3,500 kilometres and an aggregate yield of 85 megatons, which is the equivalent of the yield of 5,600 atomic bombs similar to the one which was dropped by the United States on Hiroshima.

Apart from missiles, according to AFP, French strategic nuclear forces include 36 aircraft provided with nuclear bombs as well as a nuclear-powered submarine fleet.

ZAGLADIN IN FRANCE FOR PCF SYMPOSIUM ON MARX

Meets with PCF's Gremetz

LD260512 Moscow TASS in English 0501 GMT 26 Jan 83

[Text] Paris January 26 TASS -- Meetings between member of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee Vadim Zagladin and member of the Political Bureau, Secretary of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party Maxime Gremetz were held here. Questions of the development of bilateral relations between the CPSU and French Communist Party, as well as international problems of mutual interest were discussed during the friendly conversations.

International Symposium Opens

PM251205 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Memory of Karl Marx"]

[Text] Paris, 20 Jan -- Marxism and the liberation of mankind is the topic of an international symposium devoted to the memory of Karl Marx which opened here today. The central issues of the symposium, organized by the French Communist Party's Institute of Marxist Research, are the theoretical problems raised by the changes which are taking place in contemporary capitalist society. Prominent theoreticians from 26 countries in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America are participating in its work. The Soviet delegation is headed by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V.V. Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department.

GROMYKO, ITALIAN ENVOY DISCUSS SOVIET PROPOSALS

LD251930 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 25 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, has received today Giovanni Migliuolo, ambassador of the Italian Republic to the Soviet Union, at his request.

Andrey Gromyko noted that the major importance of the foreign policy initiatives put forward by Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his report on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the USSR, and also by the Warsaw Treaty member states in the Political Declaration of January 5, 1983. It was stressed the implementation of these proposals, primarily the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Treaty member states and the states participating in the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations, would make a major contribution towards preventing nuclear war, restoring an atmosphere of trust in international relations and carrying on the process of the relaxation of tension.

Giovanni Migiuolo said that the latest proposals of the socialist states were the subject of close analysis on the part of the Italian Government.

The conversation also centered on certain aspects of Soviet-Italian relations from the point of view of continuing political dialogue between the USSR and Italy.

DUTCH 'BLACKOUT' ON SOVIET SPY INCIDENT DISCUSSED

PM251609 Brussels LE SOIR in French 22-23 Jan 83 pp 1, 8

[J.-P.C. report: "Russian Spies Quietly Expelled"]

[Text] According to Dutch sources, Belgium informed the Soviet Union last summer of the explusion of two of its nationals convicted of both military and economic espionage. The two Soviets, asked to fly back to Moscow, had in particular, apparently shown excessive interest in leading computer firms.

The information from the Netherlands is discussed this morning by an American daily because, it seems, similar activities, perhaps organized by the same individuals, were denounced and uncovered 6 or 7 years ago in a Soviet company established in Antwerp and in the Netherlands. The Elorg company, established in 1972, indulged in industrial espionage until the alarm was raised in the Netherlands in 1976. The following year Elorg's Antwerp offices were closed and a certain Khristov, a Soviet citizen, was expelled.

The two Soviets who apparently suffered the same fate last summer apparently indulged in similar activities: military espionage against NATO, and industrial espionage against Belgian or multinational firms established in Belgim and specializing in high-level computer technology.

The Soviet citizens were caught and exposed, and were then apparently asked to leave Belgian territory and put on an a plane for Moscow.

Why this use of the word "apparently" when the information comes from a reliable Dutch source? Because the Belgian foreign minister claims to know nothing about this affair. There is a reason for the blackout: The expulsion decision apparently angered the Soviets who apparently threatened Belgim with reprisals and sanctions if the measure was made public. The USSR would have liked this unfortunate little matter to go no further than the ministries and embassies, especially since it wanted to set up a consulate in Rotterdam.

The sanctions threatened were apparently anything but symbolic: immediate expulsion of two Belgian diplomats from Moscow, cancellation of important orders placed with the Belgian iron and steel industry (especially Sinmar), and an end to the transit of grain through Antwerp, where Soviet ships call in to take on board stored grain, thus it could be a serious matter. Time, however, should have tempered the Soviet wrath.

BOMBS SENT TO LONDON AEROFLOT, INTOURIST OFFICES

LD252244 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 2042 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Soviet Offices in London were the targets of two letter bombs today.

One was sent to the office of the Soviet airline Aeroflot, in Piccadilly, where it was opened by a secretary, but failed to go off.

The other was sent to the offices of the Soviet travel agency, Intourist, in Regents Street. It was left unopened until police arrived.

Scotland Yard said both letters contained incendiary devices. A spokesman said they were unlikely to have killed, but could have caused nasty burns.

Both devices were made safe by explosives officers and sent for forensic examination.

A greetings card, but no message, was found in the letter which had been opened.

Both devices were in identical white envelopes, about six inches by four inches.

SOVIET ECUMENICAL DELEGATION IN UK, IRELAND

LD251344 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 25 TASS -- Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich, who led an eucumenical delegation of churches of the Soviet Union to Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland, said in an interview with a TASS correspondent that the members of his delegation were quite satisfied with the results of the meeting held.

"The eleven days of our visit, which was paid at the invitation of the British and then of the Irish Councils of Churches," the metropolitan said, "were devoted to familiarising ourselves with the religious life of those countries. Consultations were held on the subject 'God's world and human world'.

"The communique adopted as a result of the visit shows that the sides devoted much attention to questions of concern for all people today, including Christians -- that is disarmament, which means saving humankind from nuclear destruction".

The joint communique, Metropolitan Filaret said, stresses among other things that, "if we wish our planet, especially our European Continent, survive, our countries should learn to trust each other. Peace is the concern not only of the Christians. This is general hope, especially among those who experienced the grave consequences of war... the very preparations for war are immoral and unjust."

"The world will, as before, remain in fear without disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament," says the joint communique. Therefore, the metropolitan continued, we pray that the leaders of our peoples continue talks on limitation, control and reduction of arms.

The head of the delegation went on to say that the visit to Britain had contributed towards developing and strengthening ecumenical cooperation, and can, undoubtedly, be viewed as a contribution by the churches to the common cause of strengthening the positions of the peace forces.

"Peace in our time, as we see it, has ceased to be the matter of only statesmen and politicians," the metropolitan said. "Now it is the common property of wide public circles, including believers. In working for peace, our churches are doing their Christian duty."

In conclusion Metropolitan Filaret expressed gratitude to the British and Irish Councils of Churches for the cordial, fraternal reception and to Archbishop Dr. Robert Runcie of Canterbury for hospitality and attention to the delegation.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS CABLES IRISH PRIME MINISTER

LD251202 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 25 TASS -- The USSR Council of Ministers has addressed a telegram to Garret Fitzgerald conveying congratulations in connection with his appointment as prime minister of Ireland and wishing him successes in his activities in that high post. The telegram expresses confidence that the relations between the USSR and Ireland will further positively develop for the benefit of the Soviet and Irish peoples, in the interests of ensuring peace, international security and cooperation.

In his reply telegram the Irish prime minister expressed sincere gratitude for the congratulations and good wishes.

SOVIET PROPOSAL ON CYPRUS 'TIMELY,' 'PRACTICAL'

NC251948 Moscow in Greek to Cyprus 1800 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] In his speech at the ceremonial gathering in Moscow on the Soviet Union's 60th anniversary, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Yuriy Andropov stated: We steadfastly and decisively support those who even today are forced to struggle for freedom, independence and the very existence of their peoples and who are forced to repulse the aggressors' attack or the threat of an aggression.

This concerns also the Soviet Union's position toward the Cypriot people's just struggle for the preservation of their state's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, our commentator Anayloiy Aleksin writes.

As is well known, the Soviet Union was one of the first countries that recognized the Cyprus Republic and established diplomatic relations with it. A difficult fate was in store for the Cypriots. On leaving the island, the colonialists left their military bases on it and continued to intervene in the internal affairs of the independent state, trying to compel it to give up the nonaligned policy and transform it into their springboard.

The repeated practical measures, taken by the Soviet Union to defend the sovereignty of the Cyprus Republic during the sixties and up to our days, have played a decisive role in foiling the plans of internal and external reaction which aimed at the abolition of the Cyprus state. The so-called Zurich-London agreements which were imposed on the Cypriots seriously restricted the republic's sovereignty and played a disastrous role in the tragic events of July 1974. In a corresponding announcement by the Soviet Government, dated 23 August 1974, it is stated: The hotbed of tension in the area of the eastern Mediterranean must be eliminated. On its part, the Soviet Union will also in the future work actively in this direction. During this entire period, our commentator continues, the Soviet Union's position on the solution of the Cyprus problem has been consistent and steadfast. The Soviet Union supports an immediate, steadfast and just settlement of the Cyprus problem without any foreign intervention through constructive talks, taking into consideration the legitimate rights of both communities in the island, and it supports the withdrawal of all foreign troops and the removal of foreign military bases from the island.

The Soviet Union supports the UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions which define the principles for the political settlement of the Cyprus problem, in the ratification of which the Soviet Union has played an especially serious role as Cyprus President Spiros Kiprianou has stated.

The Soviet proposal to convene a representative international conference on the Cyprus problem within the framework of the United Nations, which the Soviet Union submitted in August 1974, remains a timely one. In the Soviet Union's opinion such a conference will contribute to the solution of the external aspect of the Cyprus problem, to bringing the positions of the parties in the intercommunal talks closer and, in the final analysis, it will shorten the road toward a just and stable settlement of the Cyprus problem.

Speaking at a luncheon, given in honor of President Spiros Kiprainou at the Kremlin by the Soviet Union's Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government on 28 October 1982, President Kiprianou said that he feels great satisfaction over the fact that after the declaration of its independence, Cyprus succeeded in developing a steadfast friendship and cooperation in many sectors with the Soviet Union, a great country with huge international prestige. Our relations, Kiprianou said, are currently at a high level and are constantly expanding and becoming stronger. The Cyprus president expressed deep gratitude over the attention and inestimable support which the Soviet Union has given to Cyprus.

The Cypriots, our commentator concludes, in the future too can be certain of the Soviet Union's unselfish help and support for their just struggle. They can also have no doubts about the Soviet Union's consistent and steadfast foreign policy, the principal aim of which is the preservation of international peace.

U.S. POLICY ON LEBANON, TROOP WITHDRAWAL VIEWED

LD251623 Moscow TASS in English 1554 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 25 TASS -- TASS commentator Georgiy Kuvaldin writes:

Speaking in Washington, representatives of the U.S. State Department expressed utmost concern over slow progress at the Lebanese-Israeli talks.

The assumed "concern" of the U.S. Administration over the developments around Lebanon is caused by quite understandable reasons, which are organically linked with the general objectives of Washington's Middle East policy. While giving Tel Aviv military, economic, political and other support, the USA presently strives to derive maximum benefit from the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. The point at issue is actually to use the pretext of participation in the so-called multinational force in order to set up American bases on the Lebanese soil and impose on that country American military presence on a long-term basis. To attain that strategic goal Washington strives first and foremost to replace the legitimate demand for unconditional and immediate withdrawal of Israeli aggressor troops from Lebanon's territory, on which the Lebanese side strongly insists, with the demagogic slogan of withdrawal from Lebanon of "all foreign troops".

Therefore, it is not fortuitous that U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger said in an interview with the Cairo newspaper AL-AHRAM published today that the Reagan administration is seeking the completion of the first stage of foreign troop withdrawal from Lebanon.

Apparently, in talking on "foreign troops", Washington absolutely groundlessly places on a par Israel's interventionist force, the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peacekeeping force in Lebanon and Palestine units. The American Administration, to all appearances, intentionally closes eyes to the generally known fact that in violation of basic norms of international law Israel launched an unprovoked barbaric aggression against sovereign Lebanon, while Syrians and Palestinians stay in that Arab country in keeping with the decision of the League of Arab States and an agreement with the lebanese authorities.

Also noteworthy is the fact that the stand of Washington, which likes by word of mouth to pose for a "peace-maker" in the Middle East, is clearly at variance with the decisions of the U.N. Security Council aimed at the speediest normalisation of the situation in that region. Thus, Resolution 509 of the U.N. Security Council contains the explicit demand that Israel should immediately and unconditionally withdraw its armed forces to Lebanon's internationally recognized borders.

All this once again confirms that the USA, which is in fact an accomplice in Israel's aggression, bears all responsibility together with Tel Aviv's Zionist ruling clique for the crimes against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, the continuing occupation of Lebanese territory by the Israeli aggressors.

U.S. ARMS SALES TO ISRAEL RISK MIDEAST SECURITY

LD260412 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 25 Jan 83

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program presented by Aleksandr Timoshkin]

[Text] Representatives of the White House and the American State Department have stated that the government of President Reagan is very concerned about the deadlock in the tripartite talks on Lebanon. We note in this connection that a deadlock has arisen as a result of Israel's impertinent demands that Lebanon yield.

Tel Aviv is demanding the conclusion of security and friendship agreements with Lebanon which would postpone for a long time the solving of the question of the withdrawal of its interventionist forces from Lebanon. Lebanon -- and this is very natural -- insists on the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from its territory before anything else. This was stated anew by President Amin al-Jumayyil and by Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan. Thus, several rounds of talks, in which the United States is taking part, have ended with no result.

American and Zionist propaganda, by spreading Washington's concern in this connection have begun to make noises about what it calls American-Israeli differences. For instance THE WASHINGTON POST said that Reagan might resort to halting the delivery of American weapons to Tel Aviv as a means of punishing Israel for refusing to withdraw its forces from Lebanon. Indeed, the paper claimed that President Reagan is ready to sign documents imposing a ban on the delivery of weapons to Israel. The British DAILY TELEGRAPH said on Monday that Tel Aviv does not rule out the possibility of U.S. economic and military santions against it. As if to pour fuel on the flames of the so-called differences over Lebanon between Israel and its great partner in the strategic alliance, General Sharon stated that Washington is interfering in the Israeli-Lebanese talks and that Israel could find other ways to obtain security agreements.

This reminds us of America's so-called ban on the delivery of weapons to Israel following the attack on the Iraqi nuclear research center. The delivery of F-15 aircraft to Israel was delayed for a while. But the Israeli aggression on Lebanon went ahead nonetheless. The United States was then not content with delivering all the weapons to Israel as soon as possible in accordance with the agreements concluded between them, but delivered additional weapons, including those used for an en masse annihilation of unarmed people.

MOSCOW EXAMINES ISRAELI 'THREAT' TO SYRIA

LD211004 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 20 Jan 83

[Text] Syria has complained to the United Nations over Israel's threats to invade it. Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam's message says Syria will demand calling the Security Council if Israel keeps threatening. Our commentary has been prepared by Valentin Lapin:

Syria has every reason to be alarmed. It is virtually under the permanent threat of another Israeli aggression. Israeli troops have time and again invaded Syria. Part of Syria's territory, namely the Golan Heights, is still held by the invader. The threat of aggression grew after Israel invaded Lebanon. . At a time when the Israeli delegation and American emissaries are twisting (?arms) at the talks with Lebanese representatives, Israeli troops are amassed in the Al-Biqa' Valley and other east Lebanese regions close to the Syrian border. Israeli Defense Minister Sharon says that from Lebanese lines his guns will easily reach Damascus.

Now anyone can see that the invasion in Lebanon that Israel carried out with the United States' approval pursued far reaching goals, including a blow at Syria. First and foremost because Syria is energetically opposing Israel's policy of aggression. Israeli aviation is holding military exercises in the Negev Desert, dropping bombs on targets imitating Syrian cities. The Syrians are consolidating their air defense because they do remember the barbarous raids on Damascus and other cities during the Israeli aggression of 1973. It is these defensive measures that Tel Aviv wants to use as a pretext for aggression.

If Washington does not expect the Syrians to keep their air space open for Israeli planes why is it putting up a show of concern over Syria's defensive measures? As for Israel, it is threatening the Syrians with armed force in order to make Syria give up its defensive plans. Anyone who knows the Israeli adventurists understands that this is more than mere blackmail.

He will remember that similar threats were followed by United States-made Israeli F-15 and F-16 aircraft delivering a bandit raid on Baghdad in June 1981 and the aggression against Lebanon too followed absurd accusations and threats. In this connection, says the message of the Syrian foreign minister to the United Nations, the Syrian Government is duty bound to warn of the situation that has obtained. The Israeli statements and threats, the message says, are whipping up tension in the Middle East and elsewhere and are endangering world peace.

Further Comment

LD251522 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Analysis by observer Leonid Krichevskiy]

[Text] There are alarming reports that the Israelis are heightening tension in the vicinity of the Al-Bi'a' Valley where the Syrian units of the Arab peace-keeping forces are positioned. Israel has been transferring there reinforcements, deploying additional batteries of mortars, tanks and rocket installations. The invaders have been provoking armed clashes but anxiety stems not only from provocations by (?the) Israeli Armed Forces against Syrian troops in Lebanon.

Israel is openly threatening Syria and the campaign to intimidate Syria now underway in Israel is being accompanied by intensive preparation for aggressive action. This means that another independent Arab country is facing a direct threat. The Israeli Defense Minister Sharon has boasted in public that from Lebanon's territory his guns will reach Damascus easily. From Western press reports it is evident that the Israeli army headquarters has been planning operations to deliver air strikes on vitally important Syrian centers, including the capital Damascus. Similar actions took place back in 1973 during the Israeli aggression.

The situation is so grave that Syria has found it necessary to lodge a complaint with the United Nations. The message by the Syrian Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, said that Syria will demand that the Security Council be convened if Israel does not stop its threats.

All who are alarmed over the current situation in the Middle East share Syria's justified concern. Syria has been holding firm anti-imperialist positions, firmly opposing Israel's policy of aggression. As before, it does not intend to submit to the diktat of Washington and Tel Aviv. It is to justify its military preparations that Israel has been referring to such a phoney argument as Syria's actions to bolster its anti-aircraft defense. Needless to prove that the right to such actions belongs to any sovereign state. Without any scruples, Israel raised this question in the United Nations on the ground that Syria's actions are allegedly threatening Israel. It is hard to say what there is more in this -- hypocrisy or impudence.

Israel's threats to Syria are another indication of the aggressor's total impunity. Lebanon fell its victims last year. Now the spear of Israel's aggression is directed against Syria. Such a policy would be impossible without material and moral support from the United States. Otherwise Tel Aviv would not dare to act so brazenly.

MOSCOW PREVIEWS MUBARAK VISIT TO UNITED STATES

LD261018 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 26 Jan 83

[Text] President Mubarak of Egypt leaves today for an official visit to the United States where he will have meetings and talks with Reagan, head of the U.S. State Department Shultz and other leading U.S. figures. It has been announced that this visit will be symbol of the consolidation of partnership between the two countries.

However, observers both in the United States itself and in Egypt are very restrained in their utterances about the prospects for the forthcoming talks, believing that they will be very difficult. As a UPI correspondent reports from Cairo, Mubarak intends to insist that Washington adopt a firm position with regard to the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. Apart from this, it has become known that the Egyptian president refuses to take part in peace talks with Tel Aviv if representatives of Jordan and the Palestinians are not invited to them.

Radio Comments on Visit

LD260430 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 25 Jan 83

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program presented by Aleksandr Timoshkin]

[Text] Egyptian President Husni Mubarak is due in the United States on an official visit. He stated that he intends to discuss bilateral relations with the American President as well as the situation in the Middle East. President Mubarak described Egyptian-American relations as excellent and, as he put it, founded on mutual respect and fruitful cooperation. The Egyptian president also said he will concentrate his main attention in the Washington talks on consolidating cooperation with the United States, particularly in the military sphere. He said Cairo wants to obtain far more military assistance from the United States than it is receiving at present.

What is significant is the fact that Washington has immediately responded to this desire. The BBC reports that the Reagan administration has asked the Congress to pass a bill granting Egypt additional military assistance worth $400 million. We also notice, by the way, that this American generosity is not enjoyed by any other Arab country. Why? It appears that the main reason for this is that no other Arab state has agreed to reconcile with Israel, as As-Sadat did. Washington is fully confident that Egypt will not use American weapons against Israel. But what has motivated Egypt to spend huge sums to obtain weapons from the United States and to maintain a very large army?

'ARAFAT INTERVIEW WITH LEBANESE WEEKLY CITED

LD242000 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Text] Beirut January 24 TASS -- The White House has encouraged the ruling circles of Israel to stage aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and openly abetted the Zionists' wholesale crimes in Lebanon, Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, said in an interview with the Lebanese weekly KUAL AL ARAB [as received]. When launching a dirty aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, against women, old people and children, the Israeli army was only a tool in the hands of the Washington administration, which shares full responsibility with Tel Aviv for the mass killings in Lebanon, he emphasized. The victims of the policy conducted by the White House and Israel, its loyal puppet in the Middle East, were 72,000 innocent Lebanese and Palestinians who were killed or wounded.

The Palestinian leader pointed out that the United States crudely violated all accords reached in Beirut between Philip Habib and the PLO leadership and did not honour the assumed commitments. Moreover, he said, "we assess U.S. actions as open support for the Israeli murderers' crimes in the Palestinian refuge camps of Sabra and Shatila."

'Yasir 'Arafat expressed the firm conviction that a deal had been closed between Washington and Tel Aviv on the eve of the aggression in Lebanon, in accordance with which the United States allowed the Israeli to annex south Lebanese regions stretching as far as the Litani River.

The Palestinian leader expressed gratitude to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which have been giving all possible assistance and support to the Palestinian revolution in its struggle to implement the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. "The USSR is a state which is friendly to us," Yasir 'Arafat said. "It has always sided with our just cause and supported the rights of the Arab people of Palestine to return to our home parts, to exercise self-determination and set up an independent state of our own."

The Palestinian leader noted that the PLO is prepared for the creation of a confederation with Jordan on condition that the Palestinian state will be guaranteed independence in it.

NEW PLO REPRESENTATIVE IN MOSCOW APPOINTED

JN261145 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1122 GMT 26 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jan (INA) -- Palestinian sources told the INA correspondent here today that Rami ash-Sha'ir has been appointed PLO representative in Moscow to replace his father, Dr Muhammad ash-Sha'ir, who died of an incurable illness in Sofia on 13 January. Rami ash-Sha'ir, 29 years old, is an engineer and served as military attache in the PLO office in Moscow.

ISRAELI DEFENSE MINISTER'S VISIT TO ZAIRE VIEWED

LD212052 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 21 Jan 83

[From the "World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] Israeli Defense Minister Sharon's visit to Zaire has ended. What aims did this Zionist butcher-turned diplomat set himself for a few days?

First, he wanted to try to break the diplomatic blockade of Tel Aviv, which the majority of African countries do not want to have anything to do with on account of its aggressive policy in the Near East, and also because of the Israelis' overly-warm friendship with the South African regime.

Second, in agreement with Washington, Israel is setting itself the task of creating a bridgehead in central Africa for carrying out subversive activity against progressive states of that region.

I would like to draw your attention to an AP telegram from Tel Aviv. This says that on his return from Kinshasa Sharon did not disguise his satisfaction with the results of the trip, during which an Israel-Zairian agreement was signed on military cooperation whose main provisions envisage an increase in the number of Israeli servicemen in Zaire and Tel Aviv's active participation in the reorganization and rearmament of the Zairian Army.

Why is all this being done? Commenting on Sharon's trip the press agency notes that particular interest was shown by the Zionist hawks and Sharon himself and the military experts accompanying him in the Shaba Province, which is situated on the border of the People's Republic of Angola. Evidently, this is no coincidence.

Observers connect this aspect of the visit with a report which appeared earlier in the press on Washington's plans to open up a second front of subversive activity against Angola. Let us recall that the United States and Israel continue to give broad military political and financial support to racist South Africa in the undeclared war against Angola that is being waged in the south of the country. Now, obviously the Americans and their Zionist allies are trying to include Zaire also in the implementation of their aggressive designs on the African Continent.

SOVIET DELEGATION BEGINS VISIT TO PDRY

For Aden reportage on the 22-25 January visit of a delegation led by Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, first deputy chairman of the Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Peoples, to the PDRY, see the Arabian Peninsula section of the 26 January Middle East and Africa DAILY REPORT.

EVENTS '22 YEARS LATER' PARALLEL CUBAN CRISES

LD251132 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Text] (Charles Guest) of Mountain View, California, in the United States, has asked for the Soviet Union's view on the Caribbean crisis in the fall of 1962. Now comments on that event by Mikhail Glebov:

The source of the Caribbean crisis must be sought in the events that took place many months earlier. The victory of the revolution in Cuba in January of 1959 immediately angered Washington. The leaders of the United States at that time could not imagine that any nation in the Western Hemisphere would dare to reject American recipes and would instead want to develop independently. Washington decided to solve the problem simply by overthrowing the Cuban Government. The plan to invade Cuba was adopted during President Eisenhower's term. When Kennedy took office in 1960 he began to put the plan into action.

American instructors organized a special brigade of 1,500 Cuban emigres who opposed the revolutionary government. The emigres had American weapons, including heavy mortars and tanks. Fighters were allocated with an Essex aircraft carrier for air support and American torpedo boats transported the sabotage group from the Guantanamo base. Washington spent $80 million on the organization of the invasion, according to modest estimates. But the invasion of Cuba, launched in April of 1961, ended in the crushing defeat of the counterrevolutionaries. Despite their expectations, the population of the island formed a united front to defend the revolution. But even such a vivid referendum with weapons in hand was ignored by Washington, which began to plan more widescale aggression on the part of American troops.

The U.S. Congress adopted a special decision to use any means against Cuba, including armed forces. By the middle of September of 1962 over 100,000 troops from the infantry, armoured and airborne divisions of the American Armed Forces arrived in Florida. The Second Atlantic Fleet and infantry of the United States were put on enhanced combat readiness. All military leaves were cancelled and those due for demobilization were detained. All that was left to do was give the signal. At this critical moment Cuba asked its ally, the Soviet Union, for assistance. The necessary military hardware and weapons were sent to Cuba, including some medium range missiles. Only Soviet military experts serviced the missiles.

In response, the United States, at the end of October, took a dramatic step to escalate the conflict. Its missile bases were put on enhanced military readiness. A quarter of America's B-52's, fitted with nuclear bombs, were sent into the air and nuclear submarines took their positions for action. President Kennedy announced a sea blockage of Cuba and said they were ready to use nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union reacted by putting all its strategic forces on high alert. The world was on the verge of a thermonuclear war.

In those alarming days the Soviet Union did everything possible to prevent the catastrophe. It said that it would take down its missiles in Cuba if the United States would give up its invasion plans. After all, the missiles were only needed to rebuff such an invasion. Throughout November there were tense diplomatic consultations and finally the United States gave up its plans for an invasion of Cuba and lifted its blockade of the island. The Soviet Union took its missiles from Cuba. And so conditions were set for a solution to the Caribbean crisis.

Mr (Guest), you say that you have never heard any version of the crisis except the American one. Well, there's nothing surprising about that. Washington does not want to admit the obvious truth: The Soviet missiles on Cuba were not the cause of the crisis. On the contrary, they prevented an invasion that could have started a world war. The crisis was created by the actions of the United States, which put the world on the verge of war. The best proof of that is the fact that all Washington had to do was agree to Moscow's proposal and peace was maintained.

To conclude this brief account of that event, I would like to mention one more episode. On 3 April 1961 the U.S. State Department published a so-called white paper, which accused Cuba of organizing a plot against Latin American countries. That was done at the very moment when the last preparations were made to land counterrevolutionaries on Cuba. Today, 22 years later, Washington is making surprisingly similar claims that Cuba is threatening the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere, and that so-called international communism is guiding the partisans in El Salvador. But once again behind such claims it is possible to see the real and not concocted threat from the United States. Washington continues to arm Cuban counterrevolutionaries and openly threatens new actions against Cuba. With the help of the United States, the Salvadoran regime is waging a real war against its own people. The Reagan administration would like to continue to think of Latin America as its back yard without learning from history.

U.S. SUPPORT FOR SALVADORAN JUNTA CONDEMNED

LD242326 Moscow TASS in English 2208 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Text] Washington January 24 TASS -- The commission on U.S.- Central American relations condemned the U.S. Administration's growing support for the blood-thirsty Salvadoran junta. The commission believes that the administration's pronouncement on the so-called "progress" in the sphere of human rights in El Salvador, says a statement circulated by the commission at a press conference here today, is nothing else than an obvious lie. The commission charged that they came as a clear distortion of the current situation in El Salvador devised as a way of misleading U.S. Congress.

The commission urged the administration to cut immediately U.S. military and economic aid to El Salvador and to start an early political dialogue with the patriotic forces including the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front with a view to reaching a peaceful settlement in that country.

FEDORCHUK ATTENDS INTERNAL AFFAIRS CONFERENCE

LD252314 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Today in Moscow there was an all-union conference of the leading workers of internal affairs organs. It discussed tasks arising from the decisions of the November plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and from clauses and conclusions contained in the speech by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on questions of strengthening the safeguarding of law and order and strengthening state, labor and social discipline.

A report was delivered by Comrade Fedorchuk, USSR minister of internal affairs.

Those taking part in the conference analyzed the state of work in safeguarding law and order and the struggle against criminal encroachments on socialist property, and the legal rights and interests of Soviet citizens.

Specific measures were defined for eliminating shortcomings in the activity of internal affairs organs.

Taking part in the work of the conference were Comrade Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Savinkin, chief of a department of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Comrade Rekunkov, procurator general of the USSR; Comrade Terebilov, USSR minister of justice; Comrade Orlov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Tsinev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security and other senior workers.

MOSCOW GORKOM DEBATES TASKS, SHORTCOMINGS

LD242211 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jan 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A Moscow Gorkom conference of secretaries of primary party organizations was held today. Results of the report-back and election campaign and tasks on the improvement of organizational and political work in light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, and the instructions and recommendations made in the speech by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, were discussed. Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom delivered a report.

It was noted at the conference that all the work of the city's primary party organizations is being held under the badge of the struggle for ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of the tasks of the 3d year of the 5-year plan.

Examples of efficient and purposeful approaches to matters by party committees and party bureau were cited. It was also stated that there exist party organizations in which the state of affairs in the collective is being poorly analyzed, and the proper measures to eliminate shortcomings are not being adopted. It was stressed that the Moscow party organizations will persistently and purposefully improve their organizational and ideological-educational work, and will strive to ensure that all activity of the capital's party organizations meets the party's high demands and actively helps in the implementation of the tasks of the current stage of building communism.

Message From Andropov

LD241848 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Text] The results of the report-back and election campaign and tasks in raising organizational and political work have been discussed at a conference of secretaries of primary party organizations of the capital. A report was given by Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom. He conveyed greetings and good wishes from Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov to the secretaries of the party organizations and to all aktivists in the Moscow party organization. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee expressed confidence that the party aktiv and the entire Moscow party organization will multiply their efforts in the struggle for the implementation of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the November CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Practical measures for strengthening party influence upon the solution of production and educational tasks and for raising the vanguard role of Communists were examined in the report and in the speeches. It was noted that the entire activity of the city's primary party organizations takes place under the sign of the struggle for fulfillment ahead of schedule of the tasks of the 3d year of the 5-year plan.

ALIYEV ADDRESSES COMMUNICATIONS MINISTERS

LD242222 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jan 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Today an extended session of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Communications took place with the participation of the communications ministers of the union republics, chiefs of the communications directorates of the autonomous republics, krays and oblasts, production frontrankers and innovators and initiators of socialist competition. A report was given by USSR Minister of Communications Comrade Shamshin.

Particular attention was paid to fuller and more qualitative satisfaction of the demands of the population and the national economy concerning the communications service, and to the further development of communications and raising the intensity of production, strengthening of production and labor discipline.

Comrade Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, spoke at the session.

AZERBAIJAN'S BAGIROV RECEIVES ORDER OF LENIN

LD241904 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Jan 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] By a decree from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Comrade Kyamran Mamed ogly Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, is awarded the Order of Lenin for services to the Communist Party and the Soviet state and in connection with his 50th birthday.

TAJIK SSR ADOPTS REPUBLIC'S SOCIALIST PLEDGES

GF250546 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Excerpts] Tajikistan's Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has adopted the socialist pledges of the republic's workers of 1983. These pledges have been worked out and decided by the collectives of the unions, enterprises, organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, [words indistinct] of the city and rayon aktiv meetings, the expanded meetings of the ministries and departments, and the presidiums of the republic's trade union committees. The socialist pledges are directed at further augmenting the intensification of social production output, introducing the achievements of scientific and technical progress, strengthening the economic policy, and reducing the waste of work time. On this basis, the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress will be successfully achieved.

The obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms should [word indistinct] confirm the adopted socialist pledges in view of the organizational and the ideological educational work and widely spread socialist emulation for achieving lofty [word indistinct] in all fields of the national economy. (?It is necessary, in fact,) to maintain the unity of economic and ideological and political tasks. It is required to strengthen the role of socialist emulation in the internationalist and patriotic education of workers, to mobilize and to strengthen the struggle for expanding the republic's contribution to the all-union funds.

It has been instructed that in the ideological maintenance of production tasks an important role is played by the mass information media, [word indistinct] institutions and organizations and verbal and written propaganda so it follows that they strengthen their role in disseminating and introducing the experience of the progressive collectives, especially the experience of the red banner collectives, the individual innovators and the shock workers of communist labor. In this connection, tasks have been worked out in a way that the party committees, and [word indistinct] party organization become the forward organizing forces for fulfilling the socialist pledges and effectively influencing all forms of production and social life.

The Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau expressed confidence that the republic's workers will successfully fulfill the plans and socialist pledges of 1983 and of the 3 years of the 5-year plan period.

RASHIDOV ATTENDS UZBEK PARTY AKTIV MEETING

GF250508 Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 1300 GMT 24 Jan 83

[Summary] "In the meeting of the Syr-Darya Oblast party active in Gulistan today, the obligations of the Sry-Darya Oblast [word indistinct] in the field of consolidating the party, state and labor discipline in the light of the CPSU November Plenum decisions were discussed. The meeting was addressed by Syr-Darya Oblast party committee First Secretary Viktor Khaydurov."

The meeting decided that in order to achieve the 26th CPSU Congress decisions it is necessary that the establishments attain a certain degree of success in fulfilling their obligations. This requires the thorough utilization of the resources available to the establishments. This has become obvious by the failure of tens of factories and establishments in fulfilling the state plans. The fulfillment of the plans and socialist obligations of the 11th 5-Year plan is required by the Uzbek economy. Meanwhile, matters related to decisions concerning the basic principles of communism require the constant attention of the party committees.

"Sharaf Rashidov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, also addressed the meeting."

RSFSR MINISTER OUTLINES PLANS TO IMPROVE SERVICES

LD231230 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1240 GMT 21 Jan 83

[Text] As you know, comrades, a few days ago the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution on regulating the work schedules of plants and organizations and establishments involved in providing services to the population. The resolution notes serious shortcomings in the work of these enterprises, connected with the fact that the majority of shops, workshops, offices and housing service organizations work during the hours when the majority of workers are involved in production. This, in turn, has a negative effect on labor discipline and productivity, and in the final analysis, does great damage to the state. RSFSR Minister of Consumer Services Ivan Grigoryevich Dudenkov discusses the specific measures being taken by the RSFSR Ministry of Consumer Services to implement this resolution.

[Begin Dudenkov Recording] Clear and specific measures have been outlined which are based on the work experience of industry and the recommendation on improving the work schedules of our enterprises in conformity with the nature of work of the collectives which are served. For example, it is impossible to compare the services provided for workers of the oil and gas industry of Tyumen with those provided for the textile workers of Ivanovo, the timber workers and agricultural workers. Therefore, all these various special cases -- including those of a regional or climatic nature -- are to be found in the recommendations which have been worked out and confirmed by the ministry.

We plan that our comprehensive reception centers should, in places where it is impossible to set up a two-shift or one-and-a-half-shift system, operate on an alternate system of work: half the week the workers start early in the morning, and for the second half they finish at 9 or 10 in the evening. Such a system will make it possible, depending on the type of work, to order the service they require at their convenience.

We will transfer other enterprises to flexible worktime involving one-and-a-half- or two-shift systems. This particularly concerns hairdressing salons, photography studios, workshops for the repair of radios and televisions and household appliances, which as a result of the great rise in ownership of such goods among the population is becoming a very significant social problem. We are striving toward the goal that those workers who repair radio, television and household appliances, who work in people's homes, should work at a time suitable to the population, and that these repairmen should be able to work from very early in the morning and particularly in the evening and definitely at the weekends.

Additionally, an emergency service system is being created so that urgent repairs particularly of televisions and refrigerators, can be given immediate attention -- same-day service, as they say -- for a slightly higher fee, using radio-equipped cars attached to particular small rayons and towns. In our country, this has begun in Leningrad, Moscow and Kiev, and is now widespread throughout the RSFSR where, in 2-3 hours, immediately after the emergency call has been made, an expert appears and provides the necessary service. This is especially important for refrigerators in the summer, and of course the whole year round for televisions. We hope that in the very near future this will become a very readily available service, because the difference in price is basically trifling but the convenience is colossal.

Already such services have been established in more than 50 towns. Now there is just the question of extending its capacity, so to speak, its limits, the scope of these services among the population.

The technical side of this work has, in practice, been worked out precisely. We are limited by the number of vehicles. In this respect we are promised help from the RSFSR Government and from the USSR Gosplan. A directive has been sent to our ministers and heads of directorates concerning the urgent review, renegotiations and ratification of more convenient work schedules at each enterprise, at each comprehensive reception center. The ministry sent a special letter, containing our recommendations, to the chairmen of every krayispolkom and oblispolkom and to the chairmen of autonomous republic councils of ministers with a request to put this process under their personal supervision and to give the appropriate instructions to planning commissions and to town, rayon and rural settlement soviets so that this work can proceed with their participation, with their supervision.

I think that in the very near future the Russian people will experience substantial and fundamental progress in the improvement of work schedules at our enterprises. [end recording]

KAPITONOV ACTIVITIES IN BELORUSSIA REPORTED

PM211617 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 15 Jan 83 p 1

[BELTA report: "Comrade I.V. Kapitonov's Stay in Belorussia"]

[Text] I.V. Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who has been in Belorussia, has familiarized himself with the progress of the fulfillment of the 11th 5-Year Plan targets in the republic's industry, construction and agriculture and with party organizations' work in implementing the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum.

On 13 January Comrade I.V. Kapitonov; N.N. Slyunkov, first secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee; V.I. Brovikov, second secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee; V.A. Mikulich, first secretary of the Minsk Belorussian CP Obkum; and other comrades visited the Minsk truck plant -- one of the sector's leading enterprises. Since the beginning of the year the collective has produced additional output worth R14.7 million, including about 300 trucks. In talks with workers and specialists on the main assembly line there was a discussion of questions of further improving work efficiency and quality and labor and production discipline, making thrifty use of raw and semi-finished materials and fuel and energy resources. M.F. Lavrinovich, director of the Belavtomaz association, gave an introduction to the exhibition of the association's output and described the main avenues of the further development of production and the buildup of the production of all models of the promising family of MAZ-6422 trucks with improved technical and economic performance.

I.V. Kapitonov; N.N. Slyunkov, first secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee; and other comrades visited the Belorussian SSR exhibition of national economic achievements on the same day. On the open display area they viewed items from the republic's largest machine building enterprises -- dump trucks from the Belorussian truck plant, trucks of new designs from the Minsk and Mogilev plants and models of higly productive agricultural and road equipment.

Then they were familiarized with the exhibition display reflecting the achievements of the republic's working people in developing industry, agriculture, science and culture over 60 years in the fraternal family of Soviet peoples.

Yesterday I.V. Kapitonov, N.N. Slyunkov and others also visited several stores, familiarized themselves with new forms of organizing trade and inquired about the provision of consumer goods for the population.

On the evening of 14 January Comrade I.V. Kapitonov left for Moscow. At Minsk Airport he was seen off by N.N. Slyunkov, first secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee; I.Ye. Polyakov, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; A.N. Aksenov, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers; and members and candidate members of the Belorussian CP Central Committee and obkom first secretaries.

ACHIEVEMENTS, FAILINGS OF LITERARY PRESS ASSESSED

PM180855 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 1, 5 Jan 83 p 2

["Diary" article by "Literator": "Looking to the Future"]

[Excerpt] This newspaper has noted more than once the fact that, alongside the undoubted successes in journals last year, there were works which were patently immature and artistically weak and which suffered from shallow thematic content and derivativeness. Some of the new works published in journals were of the type which, as the poet aptly put it, "...live a few moments, were born in the morn and were dead by bed...." In fact, when you puruse the contents of the year's monthlies you cannot always recall what works with meaningful titles such as "Cold Fall" [Kholodnaya Osen], "Lifting Power" [Podyemnaya Sila], "The Old Garden" [Staryy Sad] and so on were all about.

In some cases even experienced, highly skilled writers failed to fulfill the readers' expectations.

The reader expects, for example, to be told about new happenings in the countryside today and to be presented with acute moral and psychological problems -- but what he finds is a hastily illustrated statistical summary of the successes of one farm or another.

Or the reader hopes that the writer will relate memorable chapters from the past and reveal the social significance of very important events in the history of the homeland -- but he is compelled to follow chapter after chapter of the vapid anxieties of a World War I volunteer in love with a general's daughter.

Or, for instance, the reader believes that the writer, having investigated serious omissions in a particular production sphere, will hit the target with the accuracy of a sociologist and causticity of a satirist -- but, in fact, he confines himself to cheap mockery.

While meditating on various writers' errors and blunders it is appropriate to also mention the responsibility of editorial staff who frequently fail to make economical use of journal space, allocating dozens and sometimes hundreds of pages to verbose, insubstantial efforts far removed from genuine topicality and genuine art.

Most cases of this kind have been and will be discussed in the pages of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. But on other occasions, when a work has clearly failed to provide a basis for serious discussion about the topical problems of life and literature and was clearly on the fringe of the literary process, we have thought it more appropriate to employ so-called "silent criticism," which our regular readers must have noticed. In each case we have been guided by fear of offending a much-respected writer but by the hope that this failure is nothing but an uncharacteristic episode in the writer's creative career and that it will be followed by new works far more deserving of the reader's interest and literary critical analysis.

At a time when one year has just ended and another has only just begun, I believe that the reader can expect not sorrow and annoyance but, rather, the sincere joy of sharing the lives and thoughts of impressive, major heroes of modern poetry and prose, drama and journalism.

The new tidal wave in Soviet art which was mentioned at the 26th party congress and at the 7th USSR Writers Congress becomes more and more powerful with each passing year. We have every reason for supposing that the literary press will play an even more confident part not only as collective propagandist of the best achievements of the multinational creative process but also as their collective organizer, and will meet the demands set out in the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Literary and Artistic Journals' Creative Links With the Practice of Communist Building."

Talking about the specific role of literature as an important segment of partywide work, V.I. Lenin stressed more than once: "It stands to reason that in this matter it is absolutely essential to ensure wide scope for personal initiatives and individual inclinations, scope for thought and imagination, form and content." Guided by Lenin's tenets, the Communist Party has created for Soviet writers and cultural figures the kind of conditions which permit the fullest possible implemention of the principle of true freedom of artistic creativity and provide scope for a diversity of genres, styles and creative trends. At the same time -- and herein lies another Lenin behest -- for all their wealth of genres and styles, our literature and our art have an inherent ideological unity, clear-cut social class foundation and loyalty to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. Therefore, the high ideological content, party-mindedness and popular spirit of creative art have always been for us the leading criterion the assessment of literary phenomena.

We have had a glorious year, filled with works, accomplishments and far-reaching plans. The decisions of the November (1982) plenums of the CPSU Central Committee and the report by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov at the joint ceremonial meeting of the party Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Supreme Soviet defined new, large-scale tasks whose implementation will be the leitmotiv of 1983. It is the honorable duty of every Soviet writer to participate in this work.

PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION, SPECIFICATIONS REPORTED

LD212040 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 21 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 21 TASS -- A total of 16,000 kilometres of trunk pipelines were built in the USSR in 1982. More than a third of them were gas mains with a diametre of 1,420 millimetres designed to stand pressures of 75 atmospheres. The aggregate length of gas pipelines alone in the Soviet Union has reached 144,000 kilometres.

Anatoliy Veselyev, a deputy minister of the USSR ministry for construction of facilities in the oil and gas industry, cited these figures in a coversation with a TASS correspondent to illustrate the development of pipeline transport in the Soviet Union last year. In the 1980s, he said, gas production in the USSR will grow at priority rates. It is for this reason that gas pipelines accounted for as many as 9,300 kilometres of the total of 16,000 kilometres of pipelines built in 1982. The rest were oil and foodstuff pipelines. Annual gas output in Western Siberia in the current five-year-plan period (1981-55) will grow by over 200,000 million cubic metres. To carry this fuel to the European part of the USSR lying thousands of kilometers away, it is necessary to build six gas mains with a diametre of 1,420 millimetres and to pipe gas through these pipelines under a pressure of 75 atmospheres. The overall length of the six gas pipelines is about 20,000 kilometres.

Anatoliy Veselyev pointed out that this building program is being successfully carried out. "Two of these gas pipelines have already reached the design throughout capacity and the third one has also gone on stream," he said. "Pipes have been laid on a half of the entire length of the fourth gas pipeline, the world's longest gas main which will carry natural gas from Siberia to Western Europe. This year building work will begin on the fifth cross-country line." Besides, the USSR is building gas pipelines in Central Asia, Eastern Siberia, the northern Caucasus, the Ukraine and Belorussia.

Anatoliy Veselyev said that the trunk gas pipeline construction pace is nearly twice as fast in the current five-year-plan period as it was in the previous five years. He explained this by the fact that more machines have been supplied to pipeline builders. "We buy part of pipe-building machinery abroad since the load of building work is huge. The Soviet Union also manufactures such machines itself, and they, incidentally, are not inferior to the best ones available in the world markets in any respect. The country is stepping up the production of pipe-layers and heavy-duty wheel-type trenching machines. A half of all joints are welded by automatic machines at gas pipeline construction sites in the USSR. Home-made machinery for building large-diametre gas pipelines has acquitted itself creditably both in the swampy areas of Western Siberia and in Central Asian deserts in temperatures ranging from minus 40 to plus 40 degrees centigrade, "Anatoliy Veselyev emphasized.

Refrigeration Units

LD260624 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 25 Jan 83

[Text] Sumy January 25 TASS -- An unusual refrigerator intended for trunk gas pipelines has been produced by the Sumy engineering amalgamation (the Ukraine). Its purpose is to cool gas as it flows through pipelines. The matter is that gas is pumped into pipes at a very big pressure and becomes very hot as it travels through them. In the perma frost area this causes soil to thaw as a result of which the pipeline, to quote a term of specialists, begins to swim. The refrigerator is to prevent this. The first pilot station for cooling gas has been sent to Urengoy in Western Siberia. Batch production will be started after trials.

DISCIPLINE, INCENTIVES IN ARMED FORCES VIEWED

PM211731 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jan 83 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Candidate of Historical Sciences Colonel V. Mikora article under the rubric "Social Aspects of Military Building": The Educational Role of Disciplinary Practice"]

[Text] The necessary measures are currently being adopted in our country to further increase organization and discipline in all sectors of work. This is being done in accordance with the principles laid down by the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum, which have received nationwide approval and support.

The demands made by the CPSU Central Committee plenum have been adopted as guidance for action in the Soviet Armed Forces. In implementing these demands our officer cadres persistently improve their style of work with personnel.

There is probably not one of our officers who does not know the clear formula: Discipline is a political and moral concept. It is based on servicemen's ideological commitment and the spiritual maturity of military collectives. Hence the emphasis in work to further strengthen discipline is on improving the ideological, political and military education of the motherland's armed defenders and cultivating in them an acute sense of responsibility for the country's security and the defense of socialism.

Among the main forms and methods in this work an important place belongs to the disciplinary practice of commanders and chiefs. This represents the totality of legal, moral and political means of influencing servicemen with a view to cultivating in them a conscious attitude to the fulfillment of military duty and the requirements of military discipline. Naturally, such measures of commanders' influence are an integral part of political education work and can be applied successfully only in combination with other forms and methods in this work.

Of course, disciplinary practice as a specific form of commanders' activity has its own specific content, its own peculiarities. It is implemented in the name of our socialist state and is governed by the legal, juridical principles which determine the norms of our socialist communal living, including the conduct of servicemen. It is the means by which commanders and chiefs exercise the disciplinary power invested in them. A most important feature of disciplinary practice in the Army and Navy is that it is implemented on the immutable basis of combined military and political authority [yedinonachaliye], which has been and remains the decisive organizational principle of Soviet military building.

All this has to be recalled, because the effectiveness of disciplinary practice on the educational process is largely determined by the commanders' correct understanding of its nature and content and their ability to organize it in a well-thought-out, flexible way, taking account of the particular features of different categories of servicemen, the prevailing situation and the tasks being resolved by the subunit, unit or ship. Because commanders can still be encountered who underestimate the educational role of disciplinary practice and its sociopolitical significance and moral consequences and take a narrow, one-sided view of the problem of strengthening regulation order.

The increased demands on the level of military discipline make it incumbent on commanders to improve their style of work with people. This includes improving disciplinary practice, on which the successful motivation of servicemen to behave according to regulations largely depends.

Military and naval experience and concrete sociopsychological research show that one of the most important conditions for successful disciplinary practive is the commander's ability to correctly assess the significance for society of the actions and deeds of his subordinates and the contribution to each of them to the common struggle for the constant combat readiness of the subunit, unit or ship, and to act in accordance with this assessment. This applies fully to the use of such a powerful means of influencing people as incentivies.

The political approach to the practice of incentives must be combined with consideration for its educational expediency. Teaching practice recommends highlighting and emphasizing why a serviceman stands out. This stimulates the activity of all personnel in a strictly defined direction. If actions connected with the fulfillment of tasks in combat and political training and the maintenance of constant combat readiness prevail among the reasons for incentives, the result is an improvement in the military skill of personnel and a growth in the ranks of those with excellent ratings in combat and political training and classified specialists.

But must a serviceman be rewarded always, for every meritorious action? Commanders not infrequently approach this question mechanically: If someone has achieved success, let him receive a reward; no success -- no reward. That is an erroneous position. The educational expediency of incentives is manifested either in reinforcing positive qualities in a serviceman, or in promoting the formation of qualities which he does not yet have.

Our military regulations point to precisely this approach. They are so profoundly scientific in content and constantly being updated, although naturally they cannot answer all the questions which arise from time to time in unexpected situations in life. For instance, the disciplinary regulations do not list the positive services or deeds where particular types of rewards should apply. Nor is there a list of misdemeanors for which specified penalties should be imposed on the culprits. The commander himself, within the limits of his powers, determines the type of reward for a serviceman who excels and the measure of punishment for a culprit which, in his opinion, will have the greatest educational effect both on the person it is applied to and to the military collective as a whole.

Considerable significance is attached to ensuring that incentive measures correspond to the extent of a serviceman's merits and that the motives for his conduct are comprehensively considered. Only on this condition will the incentive have educational significance and encourage the serviceman to achieve new, higher results in service activity.

Life shows that the educational effect of incentives is higher the more accurately people's individual peculiarities are taken into account. A capable serviceman who finds service and training easy should not be rewarded too often, as frequently happens. This can cause conceit and an incorrect attitude toward military labor. It is more sensible to make heightened demands on him and reward him only when he copes with more complex tasks than his comrades. Conversely, if a soldier lacks confidence in his own strength and is insufficiently prepared for the resolution of a particular task, it is expedient to reward him even for small successes, so as to reinforce his faith in himself.

That is, in fact, how experienced commanders act. Moreover, they study the prestige of a person earmarked for reward in the collective and predict the reaction of personnel to the fact of the reward. This too enables them to organize disciplinary practice more correctly.

It is very important to use diverse forms of incentive. At the same time certain commanders confine themselves to expressing gratitude to their subordinates and do not use measures for distinguishing people such as presenting a personal photograph of the serviceman taken under the unfurled banner of the unit, reporting to his home on the

exemplary fulfillment of military duty or presenting certificates of honor. The question that arises in this connection is: Should the commander perhaps be in no hurry to use the incentives provided for in the regulations, restricting himself initially to praise, approval of the subordinate, a good account of him? Only later, as the serviceman's experience and skill grow, should he be given more significant rewards, with entries on his record card.

Some damage is also done by the practice whereby lower-ranking chiefs, without having exercised their own rights, ask a senior officer to use his authority to reward a serviceman. This undermines the authority of commanders who undervalue and do not use their powers. I believe that a request for a subordinate to be rewarded by a senior officer should only be passed on when a commander has already exhausted his own rights or cannot on his own authority reward the subordinate according to his deserts.

Finally, the timing and procedure for rewarding people. Observation shows that the educational significance of this measure is lost if it is not applied in time. Unfortunately it is relatively common for the announcement of incentives earned to be postponed until a "convenient" occasion or a holiday. It is very bad if the commander and political worker fail to show concern to invest every act of awarding incentives with profound moral and political content.

I believe it is best of all to announce incentives on parade, since in this way a great influence is exerted on all personnel. I think this must be done with some ceremony. It is also useful to familiarize the personnel of the subunit with the service records of those with excellent ratings and with the book of honor where the names of distinguished servicemen are inscribed.

Publicity for incentives, their timely implementation, the commander's objectivity and fairness and his sensitivity as a teacher -- all this is of great educational significance. Only by correctly assessing a subordinate's merits and backing up the act of rewarding him with the necessary ideological, political and organizational measures is it possible to achieve the result anticipated.

It has been proved that highly effective disciplinary practice is achieved through uncompromising exactingness on the part of the commanders. Strong military discipline is ensured not only by measures of persuasion, but by measures of coercion. V.I. Lenin said that the struggle against the violation of Soviet laws and the rules of socialist communal living "...cannot be waged only through propaganda and agitation... only by selecting organizers -- it must be waged by coercion too."

This conclusion also applies directly to military organization. Every commander (chief), the disciplinary regulations state, must educate his subordinates in the spirit of undeviating fulfillment of all the requirements of military discipline, develop and reinforce their consciousness of military honor and military duty, reward the worthy and strictly punish the negligent.

By the natue of its psychological influence on the serviceman, punishment is a means of morally restraining and stopping undisciplined conduct. This coercive measure has two functions. The first is the function of coercion. The second is the function of prevention. In this sense the penalty affects not only the person who commits a disciplinary misdemeanor, but all personnel, forestalling any possible deviations from regulation behavior.

The effectiveness of such disciplinary measures is also directly dependent on the standard of ideological and organizational work by commanders and political workers and their ability to use every means of influence and on the state of military order in units, subunits and ships.

Military experience and research make it possible to formulate the educational conditions whose observance is necessary in order to ensure that punishment measures yield educational results.

The starting point for determining the type of penalty is the nature of the misdemeanor, the social damage it does and the degree of negative effect on the state of combat readiness. A disciplinary punishment will only damage the cause of education if it is imposed without consideration of the degree of blame, appears undeservedly severe or is imposed on an innocent person. Only a thoughtful, fair decision by the commander has a positive effect on subordinates.

It is educationally incorrect to punish a subordinate without knowing the real reasons which prompted him to violate discipline. Failure to fulfill this requirement makes it more difficult to choose the most effective punishment measure so as to ensure the greatest educational effect. Another necessary observation: The accurate discovery of the reasons for violations of discipline makes it possible to improve the planning of all work to strengthen discipline, eradicate the sources of negative phenomena and prevent the recurrence of past mistakes.

Whatever complex factors may have given rise to a violation of discipline, responsibility for it must be borne directly by the culprit, and also by persons whose action (or inaction) helped create the conditions for it to be committed. Unfortunately this rule is frequently broken. For instance, officers are sometimes held to account not only for their own shortcomings, but for the misdemeanors of servicemen with whose actions they had no direct connection.

Disciplinary regulations require the commander to study comprehensively and in depth the nature of the misdemeanor committed and to discover the subordinate's attitude to it. At the same time many years of experience of work with people show that disciplinary penalties are most effective where the offender and his unworthy behavior are censured by the entire collective. In this situation the offender experiences the penalty more deeply and recognizes his guilt more rapidly.

Of course, punishments, as the well-known Soviet educationalist A.A. Makarenko said, "must not daze the entire collective.... Punishments must be so rare that the entire collective pays attention to the penalty imposed." True, disciplinary regulations instruct the commander not to let a single misdemeanor by a subordinate go without taking action. But action does not amount solely to disciplinary punishments, particularly with respect to first-time offenders. Surely it is better, before resorting to punishment, to use such methods of influencing a person as reminding him of his duties, explaining the erroneous nature of his conduct and the harm done by his misdemeanor, publicly censuring the offender and so forth.

Naturally, for all this, it is necessary to act exactlingly. It is hardly correct to judge the standard of discipline in a subunit, unit or ship by the number of penalties imposed.

Exactingness needs all-round support, particularly, as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted at the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum, the support of party organizations and every member of the collective. This helps increase the educational role of leadership cadres.

Of course, a commander's (chief's) exactingness has nothing to do with rudeness, with exceeding his authority or with treating his subordinates disrespectfully, just as a concerned, sensitive attitude by a commander to their needs and his closeness to people are incompatible with familiarity and the deliberate weakening of exactingness.

The power in a commander's hands is a great force. That is why it should be used very circumspectly. That is why -- in addition to firmness and resolve -- goodwill, sensitivity and tact in relations with subordinates are required of commanders. It is important to master well the ideological content and social significance of our military regulations and to learn to creatively apply their requirements. Then disciplinary practice will have a more effective influence on educating servicemen in the spirit of loyalty to military duty and to the cause of defending the gains of socialism.

GEN TOLUBKO STRESSES ROLE OF OFFICER'S EXAMPLE

PM241107 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jan 83 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Army General V. Tolubko, commander in chief of Strategic Missile Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, under the rubric "Military Education": "Officer's Personal Example"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum, in whose work I participated, emphasized most sharply the need to enhance the level of organization and businesslike efficiency in work, to strengthen discipline and to maintain and develop in every possible way the labor and political activeness of Soviet people implementing the historic 26th CPSU Congress decisions. These demands apply in full to the activity of military cadres.

Officers constitute the basis, the backbone of our Armed Forces. Educated by the Communist Party, they are active champions of its policy in the Army and the Navy. The decisive role in the troops' operational, combat and political training belongs primarily to them. They are the inspirers and organizers of the struggle for the highest combat readiness and the further strengthening of military discipline.

Today, as never before, life makes demands on commanders and chiefs and on all officers -- to know how to work with people, to rally them into a strong military collective and to ensure high organization, discipline and regulation order in the subunit and the unit. For success here it is extremely important that every officer sets his subordinates an example in everything.

The internal service regulations emphasize that a commander (chief) must set subordinates an example of the strict observance of moral and ethical norms of behavior and the irreproachable fulfillment of the demands of the Soviet laws, the military oaths, military regulations and his own official duties.

The officer teaches subordinates military matters, and therefore he is himself obliged to know military science to perfection. He educates them, and therefore he is himself obliged to be educated, politically mature and ideologically convinced and to strictly follow the norms of communist morality. If necessary, he will lead them into combat, and therefore he must know how to give excellent leadership to the subunit and unit and set an example of courage, steadfastness, endurance and heroism.

I remember the officers of the tank brigade which I commanded during the Great Patriotic War. With the majority of them I traveled hundreds and thousands of kilometers along frontline roads and saw them in very different situations, sometimes extremely dangerous and complex situations. They always emerged from a difficult situation with honor. In everything -- large and small -- their behavior and actions accorded with out lofty military, party and moral norms, and therefore they possessed a special strength -- the inspiring strength of personal example.

Many talented military leaders subsequently grew from the Soviet frontline officers hardened in the fire of battles.

They included Chief Marshal of Artillery Mitrofan Ivanovich Nedelin, the first commander in chief of the Strategic Missile Forces, who for me and many other officers and generals was a real teacher and set an example of strict observance of the Leninist style in work and selfless service to the motherland.

I recall the spring of 1960 -- the initial period of the organization at the time -- we had to tackle simultaneously the construction of launch positions, the formation of units and the mastering of complex new hardware.

One foul April day the commander in chief came to a test site where an experimental model of a missile was being prepared for final tests. Everything was ready for the most crucial stage of the work when suddenly, at night, when the cold was particularly severe, the electric heading in the missile's special warmth-retaining jacket failed. What was to be done? To recheck the missile under laboratory conditions meant delaying its adoption into the arsenal.

Mitrofan Ivanovich stayed cool and sober-minded and, as chairman of the interdepartmental commission, was in no hurry to make a decision. He listened to the recommendations of scientists and designers, asked specialists to assess how the temporary disruption of the temperature regime might affect the condition of the missile and, after a careful analysis, gave the "go-ahead" to complete the tests within the time prescribed by the schedule. The test was successful.

During that sleepless night on the test site we saw for ourselves how important it is to keep cool and sober-minded and to make considered, accurate decisions. I will not be exaggerating if I say that it was a real lesson for us.

Any military collective is a complex organism, and with missilemen it is also a specific organism, as missile weapons are strictly collective weapons. A high degree of organization, efficiency and coordination in the actions of all their elements, strong military discipline and firm regulation order constitute the prime basis ensuring the constant combat readiness and vitality of the missile subunit or unit. The significance of discipline has always been great, and now, in the age of nuclear weapons and of the great scope, dynamism and complexity of combat operations, its role is increasing immeasurably. The smallest violation of military, "technological" discipline or combat duty discipline can complicate the fulfillment of a combat task. Our commanders and political workers direct their efforts primarily toward fostering high political awareness and irreproachable efficiency in servicemen. Here they proceed from the premise that personal example is a particularly effective means of education.

The effectiveness of the impact of an officer's personal example is greater the stronger is the unity between his words and his actions and the more naturally his high exactingness is manifested in conjunction with his painstaking education of people and his paternal concern for them. Even many years later former subordinates remember such an officer with warmth and gratitude: "An exacting and fair commander." This is the highest praise, which can really be envied. It is merited by him who can rightfully be called an educator and pedagogue and who enjoys great authority with his subordinates.

I have repeatedly visited the missile unit commanded by Lieutenant Colonel M. Kolosov. His Army career coincides with the history of the emergence and development of his own branch of troops. In 1961 he graduated from military school with distinction. He successfully commanded a subunit in one of the units. There he received real combat training and joined the ranks of Lenin's party. Then he studied at an academy, and on graduating he served once again in remote missile garrisons. For several years he was chief of staff and then commander of a unit. He has now been promoted.

Lt Col M. Kolosov is an officer with a keen sense of responsibility for his assigned task, and he has a flair for everything new and progressive and knows how to conduct training in close unity with people's education. He sets an example of sociopolitical activeness and discipline, has perfect knowledge of hardware and is a master of military matters. He is steadfast and tactful in any, even the most tense teaching situation. His subordinates value this. They also value the fact that he has a constant natural need to mix with them. In this he engages people in frank, sincere conversation in which they and their sentiments and needs become known more fully.

However, no one considers Kolosov as such a "soft touch." When necessary, he is strict, strong-willed and uncompromising. Yet his strictness offends no one, as it is always fair and according to regulations.

Discrepancies in observing the daily routine were once noted in one of the unit's subunits. The subunit's commander complained of the personnel's big workload. Even though Comrade Kolosov was not convinced by this argument, he did not give the young commander a "rocket." He entrusted a group of staff officers with comprehensively studying the situation in the subunit. What was the result? The cause proved not to be the personnel's excessive workload at all, but lack of organization and flaws in planning the teaching process and in drawing up the timetable of lessons and training sessions.

Only after this did a stern conversation with the subunit commander take place. It was continued somewhat later at a party meeting. Relying on the results of an in-depth analysis, Comrade Kolosov helped the officer to understand and eliminate the reasons for the shortcomings.

It would be hard to find an officer who does not seek to become an authoritative chief and acquire the qualities necessary for this. However, there are still people among them who endeavor to win "easy" authority by means of various indulgences. They do not notice, say, minor violations or the inexact fulfillment of orders and instructions. Subordinates quickly "latch onto" such an officer's attitude and, as a rule, ultimately lower their efficiency.

There can be no real success in an officer's service life without profound knowledge of military regulations, strict observance of their demands and intrasigence toward everything that hinders the assertion of military order. The unity of the words and deeds of any commander or chief must manifest itself, above all, in precise and strict observance of regulation demands. For it sometimes happens that an officer verbally campaigns for regulation order in every way possible and does not overlook the misdemeanors of subordinates, while he himself deviates from regulation demands in some way, perhaps even [only] a small way. The impact of such exactingness, when it applies more to subordinates than to the commander personally, is not very great.

Service and combat training sometimes place an officer in complex and, in individual instances, even critical situations demanding coolness, courage, an immediate accurate response and quick, correct decisions. A training session in one of the subunits was devoted to practicing grenade throwing. The exercise was led by Major Ye. Grivans. Everything was going strictly to plan. Suddenly something unexpected happened. Pulling out the safety pin, one of the young soldiers raised his arm to throw. But the throw did not come off: The grenade slipped from his hand and fell 3 meters from the soldier. Everyone froze, expecting an explosion in less than 4 seconds. Then came the order "Lie down!" Maj Grivans rushed toward the grenade and covered it with his body. There was a muffled explosion. Maj Grivans died saving the life of a young serviceman. He was posthumously awarded the Order of the Red Star.

Let us emphasize especially that all this happened in a training situation, not at the front, in combat, with whining bullets and shrapnel which can cut short someone's life at any moment.

Maj Grivans' feat appears all the more noble and lofty to us. His courage literally shook the young soldiers. They will always remember him and tell their relatives and friends and their children of him, emphasizing what splendid officers teach soldiers military matters and educate them to be loyal to their military duty, bold and fearless.

It is rightly said that education means, above all, the correct behavior of the educator himself. An officer's personal example acts as a great visual aid and an irresistibly effective means under whose influence the consciousness, convictions, character and high moral and combat qualities of subordinates are shaped. Ensuring the personal example of all officers without exception in the fulfillment of their official duty and in their conduct means making a weighty contribution to further strengthening military discipline and organization and to enhancing the troops' combat readiness.

DOSAAF OFFICIAL ON DEFENSE WORK MONTH, TASKS

LD231316 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 23 Jan 83

[Text] The all-union month of mass defense work starts today. It is dedicated to the 65th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. At the microphone is Lieutenant General Vladimir Vasilyevich Mosyaykin, deputy chairman of the USSR DOSAAF Central Committee.

[Begin recording] The all-union months of mass defense work held to mark the anniversaries of the Soviet Armed Forces have become significant for their truly national traditions.

During these days the country's largest mass public organizations -- the Komsomol, the trade unions and DOSAAF -- are arranging their own unique examination of their activities in carrying out Lenin's behests and the party's directions on the defense of the socialist fatherland. DOSAAF is rightly called the reserve and aid of the Armed Forces. Millions of defenders of the motherland have passed through the DOSAAF educational organizations and clubs. The present month of work is being held on the eve of the Ninth All-Union DOSAAF Congress. The defense society is meeting this significant event with increased numbers and a stronger organization. There are now over 103 million people in its ranks. Our successes are considerable but there is still much to be done.

The tasks which have now been put before us by the 26th party congress and the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenum demand a creative and qualitatively new approach to the organization of the DOSAAF committees and work organizations in assisting in strengthening the country's combat ability and in training young people for service in the Armed Forces.

During this month DOSAAF members, Komsomol members and Pioneers will visit military units, military ships and military education establishments and will take part in visits to areas of revolutionary and combat glory. Ex-frontline soldiers, troops of the Soviet Army and Navy and production frontrankers will be honored guests at plants, sovkhozes and kolkhozes vocational training schools, schools and higher education establishments. Festivals of military-patriotic films, exhibitions of technical work, competitions in technical and military applied types of sports will be organized. All the functions arranged during the all-union month are aimed at further strengthening the unity of the Army and the people and at improving the quality and efficiency of the mass defense and military patriotic work among the population. [end recording]